

JAN 28



Concordia Theological Monthly



F E B R U A R Y . . . 1 9 5 4

Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, F. E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER,
RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER,
FREDERICK E. MAYER, ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN,
WALTER R. ROEHR, LEWIS W. SPITZ

CONTENTS

| FOR FEBRUARY, 1954 | PAGE |
|---|------|
| THE WORD IN THE WORD. <i>Walter R. Roehrs</i> | 81 |
| THE COVENANT OF BLOOD. <i>Paul G. Bretscher</i> | 109 |
| HOMILETICS | 126 |
| BRIEF STUDIES | 138 |
| THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER | 147 |
| BOOK REVIEW | 163 |

Goodspeed, Edgar J.: As I Remember. — Tenney, M. C.: The New Testament. An Historical and Analytical Survey. — Grossouw, William: In Christ. — De Wolf, L. Harold: The Theology of the Living Church. — Martin, Walter R. and Klann, Norman, H.: Jehovah of the Watchtower. — Wieand, Albert Cassel: The Gospel of Prayer. — Weber, Otto: Karl Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik. — Walsh, Chad: Campus Gods on Trial. — Herman, Steward Winfield: Report from Christian Europe. — Johnson, F. Ernest: American Education and Religion. — Parsch, Pius: The Breviary Explained. — Ketter, Peter: Christ and Womankind. — Sollitt, Kenneth W.: Preaching from Pictures. — Seidenspinner, Clarence: Great Protestant Festivals.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

of
lo.

GE

31

99

26

68

17

53

ant.

De

nd

me

b,

s-

b,

t,

t-

g

e

r

,

C

V

T

as
T
its
W
in

I

te
an
on
st
(L
ta

O
te
W
te
di
co
ca
bo
bo
ec

d
T

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXV

FEBRUARY, 1954

No. 2

The Word in the Word

By WALTER R. ROEHRs

(ED. NOTE: This essay was read in London, Paris, and Bad Boll, Germany, as a part of the program of the European theological conferences, conducted by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod during the past summer. It concerns itself exclusively with the relationship of the incarnate Word to the written Word of God. Other essays dealt with the Word of God as a means of grace in the proclamation of the Gospel.)

In our topic the same noun occurs twice: the *Word* in the *Word*. By its formulation our topic also asks us to think of these terms in a given relationship to each other: the *Word in the Word*.

Thus the problem is stated. Two concepts, identical to the extent that they can be represented by the same semantic symbol, are to be differentiated from each other by their relationship to each other. In a somewhat less cryptic form our topic could also be stated thus: What is the relationship between the Word made flesh (*Logos ensarkos*) and the written Word of Scripture (*logos graphos*)?

There appears to be abundant reason for asking this question. One frequently finds the term "Word" used so vaguely in contemporary theology that all distinctions are blurred. Word and Word become a paronomasia, *ein Wortspiel*, with a *double entendre*. On the other hand, Word and Word dare never be so differentiated that they confront each other from opposite poles, contradicting or negating each other. The fact that the same vocable may denote either concept indicates that there is a sensitive balance of meaning that must be preserved and that nothing dare be placed into either side of the scale that would disturb this equilibrium.

As intimated by these introductory remarks, this essay will endeavor to set forth a twofold relationship of the Word to the Word. The first involves

I

CONTRASTS

In taking up the distinctive and distinguishing features of each concept, we must, at the very outset, underscore the basic fact that we are not dealing with contrasts that involve categorical antitheses. But since certain characteristics are found in only one or the other concept, but not in both, we are justified in pointing out a number of

A. Valid Contrasts

1. The first distinction that must be stated unequivocally is this, that the *logos graptos* declares the *Logos ensarkos* alone to be the object and content of saving faith.

In an absolute and final sense it is only faith in Christ Jesus that snatches me from the powers of darkness and translates me into the inheritance of light. Scripture answers the question: "What must I do to be saved?" thus: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house" (Acts 16:31). Scripture knows of no other foundation of saving faith than that which is laid: Jesus Christ.

Among evangelical Christians this is a self-evident and uncontested fact. It deserves special mention here, however, to obviate the misconception that acceptance of the full authority of Scripture puts a book in the place of Jesus Christ as the foundation of faith. Those who accept the unabridged authority and claim of Scripture have always recognized that the *Logos ensarkos* and the *logos graptos* do not stand in an identical relationship to faith. But perhaps this distinction has not been underscored sufficiently at all times, simply because it was not the real point at issue.

To substantiate this view I shall quote, for example, from John Schaller, who writes in the *Theologische Quartalschrift*, April, 1920, p. 145: "This belief (in Scripture) is not *in itself* an essential part of saving faith, not only because a person may very well have the saving faith without even knowing of the existence of the Bible as the book of God's revelation¹ . . . but also because such belief in the divine origin of the Bible may also be found in the *unregen-*

¹ As an example Schaller refers to the faith of the baptized infant; Schreiner refers to Abraham, who believed "without even having a page of the Bible in his hands," p. 37 in *Ist die Bibel Gottes Wort?*

erate (cf. the scribes and Pharisees as described in the New Testament) without ever leading to their conversion." Schaller therefore rejects Baier's contention: "*fides iustificans generalem illam fidem praesupponit et includit.*" The author, of course, also emphasizes in the same connection that acceptance of the entire Scripture thereby does not become a matter of indifference, for he continues: "It is unthinkable that a believer should rely on some selected statements of the Bible as spoken by God while he rejects other statements as inventions of men."

Hence the Word of God in its strict sense is the saving message of Jesus Christ. Schaller refers to a number of passages which bear this out: Rom. 1:17; Luke 8:11; John 17:6; Acts 4:31; 13:46; Rom. 9:6; 1 Cor. 14:36; 1 John 2:14; 1 Peter 1:25. But "although the Bible never describes itself by this name,"² it will become evident that the term "Word of God" is applicable to Scripture in this sense that the Word laid down in Scripture is the object of our faith since it demands to be heard and accepted as the Word of divine revelation.

2. Another contrasting relationship between the Word and the Word must emerge from the observation that although the noun *logos* in the singular denotes both concepts, as the testimony of and through Christ it occurs in the singular and the plural. It is the antithesis of the Word and the words.

There is, of course, only one *Logos ensarkos*. He is the singular occurrence of a *hapax*; hence no plural is possible. But it is a striking fact that it is none other than the evangelist St. John who not only uses the term *logos* frequently in this sense, but also employs the singular and the plural of *logos* to designate the witness of and to Christ preserved in Scripture. The Word speaks words. John 12:48: "The Word (*logos*) that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the Last Day." John 14:23, 24: "If a man love Me, he will keep My words (*logon*), and My Father will love him . . . he that loveth Me not keepeth not My sayings (*logous*); and the Word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's which sent Me."

We must furthermore not overlook the fact that the same Evangelist does not hesitate to designate the Word and the words spoken by the Word by means of the synonym of *logos*, *rema*, in the sin-

² Schaller, p. 144.

gular and the plural. *Rema*, however, never occurs as a synonym of the *Logos ensarkos*.

This contrast deserves mention. One at times hears references to Jesus as the Word as if there were no words by Him or concerning Him and as if *logos* occurred only to designate the personal Word made flesh. This conception is not correct, for we are brought into contact with the *Logos ensarkos* and receive His salvation by means of the words which He and others through "the Spirit of Christ, who was in them" (1 Peter 1:10), have spoken, preserved for us, and declared to us in the Scriptures.

The dead but risen and glorified Word Himself makes this distinction between Himself and the words by which He conveys and channels His blessings to men. Confronting His disciples on the way to Emmaus, He makes Himself known, in order to be apprehended by them, not by the fact of His presence but on the basis of the written Word. Luke 24:44-47: "These are the words (*hoi logoi mou*) which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures and said unto them: Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

If He made Himself known thus, then it certainly behooves us also to seek Him as the Word *in* the Word, in the words of Scripture which testify of Him. The Lutheran World Federation convention at Hannover offered much edifying material under the general topic of "The Living Word." But the distinction between the Word and the Word was obliterated in some written and oral presentations, at least it was not set forth clearly. At times the utterances seemed to give way to a Christological spiritualism. The door to every aberration will swing wide open the moment we lose sight of the basic truth that Word and Word remain the Word *in* the Word, for the Word says: "If ye continue in My word (*to logo mou*), then are ye My disciples indeed" (John 8:31).

3. If this statement is true, then we must not overlook another contrast between the *Logos ensarkos* and the *logos graptos*. It is

the distinction that must be made also as to the manner, or mode, of God's revelation in the Word made flesh and the written Word respectively. To obviate any misunderstanding arising from a pun on the term "Word," I shall refer to these two processes of God's revelation as incarnation and inverbation.³

In His revelation God communicates with us. But "God spoke at sundry times and in diverse manners" (Heb. 1:7). He hath indeed "in these last days spoken unto us by His Son" (Heb. 1:2). How did He speak to us by His Son? The answer is: by the incarnation. As already stated, when the Word was made flesh, God spoke a Word of revelation that is *hapax*. God did not reveal Himself in that manner again; no other human being has the distinction that in him "dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily (*somatikos*)" (Col. 2:9). Hence Jesus is the revelation of God in a most singular, unprecedented, unrepeated manner. John 1:18: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." Therefore this Word speaks words of divine revelation in the authority of His own person: "I say unto you." Coming from the bosom of the Father as the eternal *Logos*, He is able to speak as did the Prophets: *kob amar Jahweh* (Thus saith the Lord), but is not in need, as they were, of awaiting the *neum Jahweh* (the oracle of the Lord) for the authentication of His message. His authority is: "I and the Father are One."

Not only what He says is God's Word. Everything He is, does, and endures is the declaration of God's eternal counsel, a proclamation of the decree made before the foundations of the earth . . . before "all things were made by Him" (John 1:3). Because "in Him was life, and the life was the light of men" (John 1:4), the purpose of this unprecedented, unequaled, and unrepeated revelation was not merely to bring us authentic knowledge of God, but to reconcile us with God in the flesh. This happened only once and is the miracle of the incarnation.

However, God did not speak to men only through His Son, but

³ Again it is true that even these two differentiating terms do not connote absolute opposites. The Word made flesh and the Word appearing in human language and spelling are both the revelation of God. But by employing two terms we desire to stress the fact that each Word comes to us as a revelation of God in a manner differing from the other and with a specific purpose.

"at sundry times and in diverse manners." What did He do to communicate His holy and gracious will to men? In order to inform men of the salvation in the Word made flesh before and after the *kairos* of the incarnation had come, He employed another miracle of revelation, the miracle of the inverbation. God did not become human flesh; God came in human words. But this coming of God is and remains for me just as mysterious and incomprehensible as the incarnation. As little as I can fathom how the Babe in the manger at Bethlehem is Mary's and God's Son, so little can I explain how it is possible for God to communicate His divine thoughts of mercy in the imperfect language and accents of fallible men. He does tell me that He designated and employed special men as media of His revelation. Proksch (Kittel, *s. v. logos*, p. 96) says, for example: "In his [Jeremiah's] discourse Jahweh's Word takes on form (*verkoerpert sich*) (Jer. 1:11, 12), and the Roll of the Book, which he writes with the help of Baruch, contains nothing but the words of God (Jer. 36:2: 'Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee'). But this Word also exerts a compulsion upon Jeremiah against which his own nature revolts (20:7 ff.); this Word is very definitely distinguishable from his own human thoughts. . . . The Word of God, which does not arise from his own soul, but invades it like a searing fire, compels him to reproduce it in his proclamation."

Incarnation and inverbation, then, have this in common: both are the unique revelation of God. But this fact does not authorize us to speak of them as if they were one and the same act of God, accomplished in the same manner and for the same purpose. In the second part of this essay, when we take up the analogy that exists between them, we shall come back to this point.

In establishing the right relationship between Word and Word, we must, however, also beware lest we set up

B. Incorrect Contrasts

In many quarters of theological thought the view is frequently expressed that antitheses must arise as soon as we equate God's Word and Scripture, or, to put it differently, when the claim is made that Scripture not only contains the Word of God but also *is* the Word of God. The opposition to this equation arises in part from

a false understanding of the Word of Scripture. But it is also the result of faulty reasoning, permitting only one conclusion of an alternative to stand when both statements of the alternative are true. An example would be the false statement "A tree cannot be green because it is firm" when in fact the tree is green *and* firm.

1. The first incorrect contrast that we must guard against appears in the statement frequently heard: Scripture is the dead letter of a book; the Word of God is a living power.

The latter sentence of this antithesis is, of course, acknowledged as true by all concerned: The Gospel is "the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16). "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," John 6:63. "So then, faith cometh by hearing" (Rom. 10:17).

But does this positive statement about the Gospel necessarily include and prove the contrasting negative conclusion: Hence Scripture is not dynamic, but static and a dead letter? Is there no other logical alternative than to conclude: The Gospel loses its power and becomes the lifeless letter of a dead book, becomes *dinghaft* (mere matter) if and when it is committed to writing and is preserved for us in this written form?

The answer is: Such a contrast is not a logical necessity. There is an alternative which is not excluded by the affirmation of the power of the Gospel. No, the tree is not only firm, but also green. Scripture does not merely have the static form of the written and printed word, but it is also and at the same time and for that very reason dynamic and living, the *dynamis* of God.

But does not Scripture itself speak of the dead letter of Scripture and thus validate the above contrast? Yes, it is true that Paul refers to a use of Scripture that leaves the reader dead in unbelief. He knows that the power inherent in Scripture is not that of magical formulae that snap into action automatically by mere recitation. Therefore Scripture, he says, can be prevented from exerting its life-giving power when the reader or hearer insulates himself against it by unbelief. This happens when Scripture is not read, regarded, and accepted as the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Scripture cannot bring life to him who denies that the *graphe* (Scripture) testifies to the Coming One, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is

a fulfillment of the *graphe*, which is set down for me in the *grammata* (the letters). 2 Cor. 3:14-17: "But their minds were blinded, for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Hence not the least shadow of criticism falls upon *ha geographiai* (what is written), because Paul, through the Spirit, has learned to know that this Scripture was given by God in order to be a *pайдагогos* to Christ. But for the person who denies and obviates this God-intended purpose of Scripture it is not a source of life. It leaves him dead in trespasses and sin, no matter how often he reads it.

But although Scripture does not quicken automatically or magically, it is not dead. Paul nowhere calls it dead. It is not neutral. When it does not save, it kills. Its letters decree death to everyone who has not found refuge from their curse in Jesus Christ. Therefore Paul wants to exercise the ministry not of the unfulfilled letter, but of the New Testament fulfillment. "For the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. 3:6).

The fact that this *graphe*, the Old Testament itself, wants to be understood thus is also recognized by Paul. Cf. Romans 10. For after he has pointed to the Old Testament as God's Law and to Christ as the *telos* (end) of the Law, he says: "That is the Word of faith which I preach" (v. 8); "for the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed" (v. 11); "for [again a quotation from Scripture] whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (v. 13). "But they have not all obeyed the Gospel, for Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" (V. 16.) Furthermore, the well-known words of Gal. 3:11: "But that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident; for [again a quotation from Scripture] the just shall live by faith." In 1 Cor. 2:9, 10 Paul shows again from what is written that this knowledge must be effected by the Spirit: "But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit."

Gramma and *nomos*, *gramma* and *graphe*, are therefore inter-

changeable synonyms for the written form of the revealed will of God. All have a killing effect if they are interpreted and read without the *charisma* of the Spirit, who works faith in Christ as the fulfillment of all of Scripture. In themselves, in their origin and in their intended purpose, they are not dead, for Paul can also say: "Wherefore the Law is holy, and the Commandment holy and just and good. Was, then, that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the Commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the Law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." (Rom. 7:12-14.)

Because this passage from Paul is quoted so often in order to prove that Scripture contrasted with the proclamation of the Gospel is dead, it was necessary to append this somewhat long digression regarding the opinion of the Apostle regarding Scripture.

The fact that I do not give up the dynamic power of Scripture when I equate the Word of God and Scripture becomes evident also from many other passages which indicate the purpose of the written Word. The incarnate Word, as well as the Evangelists and Apostles show by their use of Scripture that the latter is not a dead letter.

At the end of the *Logos* Gospel, John says: "But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through His name" (John 20:31). In the same way Jesus says: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me" (John 5:46). Scripture supplies Jesus with a live weapon of defense to ward off temptation. It is the triple *gegraptai* which puts Satan to flight (Matt. 4:4-7). Scripture is the *dynamis* through which that repentance which is necessary for faith is effected: "By the Law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:20). In saying this, Paul is referring to the *grammata* of the Law: "For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one" (Rom. 3:9, 10). The knowledge that the Law has this wholesome effect, but becomes a killing letter when one endeavors to be justified before God by means of the Law, is also brought about by Scripture: "For as many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse, for it is written, Cursed

is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them [Deut. 27:26 f.]. But that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God it is evident, for [Rom. 1:17: 'It is written'] the just shall live by faith." (Gal. 3:10, 11; Hab. 2:4.) Furthermore, saving faith in the redemption from the curse of the Law also proceeds from Scripture, because Paul continues: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, for it is written: Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree" (Gal. 3:13). The assurance that no one is excluded from this salvation from the curse of the Law also is derived from Scripture: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed . . . as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations" (Rom. 4:16, 17). By means of Scripture this faith is also safeguarded against offense: "For they stumbled at that stumbling stone, as it is written: Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and rock of offense; and whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed" (Rom. 9:32, 33; cf. Is. 28:14, 16). From Scripture, faith, when it is tried in affliction, can also draw the power to cling to the love of God. Rom. 8:35-37: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For Thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us."

These examples could be multiplied. On the basis of those cited it is sufficiently evident that the following contrast is not valid: The Gospel is the power of God; Scripture is a dead letter. We conclude this section by asking: Who are we to prescribe to the Giver of that revelation through which we are to be saved: You dare not express and lay down Your revelation in words consisting of letters; if You do so, then Your power to accomplish what You desire is dissipated and must cease? Our confession: "I believe that Jesus Christ is my Lord," dare not be elaborated into: "but I am the lord of His Scripture."

2. If Scripture is not a dead letter, but the dynamic Word of God, then we have already provided a reason why the next contrast

cannot be established: The Word of God makes men free; the letter enslaves.

This antithesis, however, merits some scrutiny because an unequivocal and unconditional submission to all the statements of Scripture is often misunderstood and misinterpreted. Such an obedience to the written Word is termed legalistic Biblicism. The yoke of Rome, it is said, is merely replaced by a pope made of paper pulp (*papiernes Papsttum*, Schreiner, p. 45) and the free exercise of our faith is again shackled by a religion of legal restraint and compulsion.

But this contrast is not valid. Submission to Scripture is not in the nature of repression by the demands of an external legal code or of compulsion by any extraneous force (at least it should not be and does not have to be). Obedience to Scripture is the obedience of Christ engendered by the Scripture. When the believer bows in humility and surrender to Scripture, he is actuated by the same "force" that "compels" him to obey any of God's precepts: the love of Christ constrains him.

The passage from Paul to which we alluded above actually deals in its real context with the freedom from the Law and from the letter of the Law. How did this freedom come to be? Did it not come into existence when Christ fulfilled the Law that kills and was laid down in letters, when He permitted Himself to be killed in order to deliver a deathblow to the written Word of the Law and to deprive it of its deadly effect and claim upon us? The letter of the Law contained in the *graphe* has as its purpose — and this is the purpose established by God — that its curse is to kill, kill with eternal death. For the unbeliever Scripture is and remains not only dead, not only an enslaving, but even a killing letter of the curse of the Law. Paul's experience on the way to Damascus therefore did not eventuate for him in a denial of this authority and claim of Scripture. But because the veil of unbelief was there removed from his eyes, he was given the joyous conviction that he had been liberated from the coercive power and the damning curse of the Law through Him who nullified the enslaving and killing effect of the Law in that He, being made under the Law, redeemed us from the curse of the Law.

Hence Paul can call the whole Old Testament *nomos* (1 Cor.

14:21; Rom. 3:10-18), but he can also prove from the same *nomos* that the threat and the curse of the Law have been rescinded and abolished for him who through faith is in Christ, the Fulfiller of the Law. There is no condemnation, no enslaving and damning Law, for the believer. Because the Ceremonial Law, according to God's counsel and economy of revelation, was to serve as pointing forward to the coming of Him through whom the Law was fulfilled and abrogated, this legal code, this *skia* (shadow) of the body, could no longer stay in effect when the *Logos* became flesh. Even the Law, written by God into man's heart and then spelled out in the recorded laws of the inscribed tablets, has ceased to have any coercive or damning power for him who embraces this Fulfiller of the Law in faith. To the self-righteous, who desire to be accepted by God on the basis of their doing the works written in the *nomos*, the Law still proclaims the threat of eternal damnation; it curses the unbeliever; it condemns the works of the flesh that proceed from the unbelieving heart.

For the believer, then, inasmuch as and in as far as he embraces Christ in faith, there no longer exists a letter of the Law, written or unwritten, that enslaves him. He does the will of God in the obedience of Christ. And in this same childlike obedience, motivated by love, he submits also to the words which came to him through the Spirit of Christ and are given to him for his instruction in doing the will of God. I believe in Scripture as it stands, not because of any external coercion of its letters; but because of the liberty wherewith Christ has made me free I desire to be His obedient child and to hearken to every word of this Redeemer.

Yes, indeed, the Scripture enslaves. That is a function of Scripture inasmuch as it also contains the Law. But it enslaves and condemns only unbelief. We should add here, however, that unbelief expresses itself not only in the coarse deeds of the flesh, but also in every contradiction to God's will, which emanates from the unbelieving heart as its source and fountain. All self-will, which refuses to bow to every word of God's revelation, thus becomes subject to the same condemning judgment of Scripture. This is true also because the incarnate Word requires this obedience to the inspired Word. He upbraids and condemns the unbelief of His disciples from Scripture: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the

Prophets have spoken. . . . And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke 24:25, 26). He castigates and condemns the unbelief of the Pharisees with the words of Scripture and demands the acceptance of His person because Scripture demands it! "Jesus saith unto them: Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The Stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the Head of the corner. This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" (Matt. 21:42.) Because the Pharisees rejected this word of Scripture, "they sought to lay hands on Him" (Matt. 21:46). Jesus excoriates the unbelief of the Sadducees with these words: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God . . . but as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God" (Matt. 22:29, 31). In a succeeding verse (v. 34) we read that by this application of Scripture to the Sadducees "He had put the Sadducees to silence." Where can the brothers of Dives find the condemnation of their ungodly lives and how can they be led to repentance? The answer is: "They have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them . . . if they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead" (Luke 16:29, 31). When the Pharisees wanted to know what God condemns as sin, Jesus refers them to the sum of the divine Law laid down in Scriptures (Matt. 22:37-40). Jesus pronounces His "woes" upon the unbelief of the Pharisees on the basis and in the name of the written Law. Yes, it is true, Scripture enslaves and condemns men; Jesus condemns men by means of Scripture. But Scripture condemns and enslaves only such as continue in unbelief, and unbelief in every form.

The Apostles followed in the footsteps of their Lord. Paul, e. g., inveighs against the presumption (*hybris*) of unbelief, which rejects the Gospel (to the Jews, a stumbling block; to the Greeks, folly) by calling attention to "the weakness of God . . . that is stronger than men. . . . That, according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord" (1 Cor. 1:25, 31). In the same way he condemns the pride of men, which expresses itself in their relationship to their fellow men, with the instruction: "Learn . . . not to think of men above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another" (1 Cor. 4:6).

And how shall we condemn unbelief today, also and specifically the unbelief of false doctrine, if we do not employ this "enslaving" power of Scripture? What right would we have, for example, to condemn the work righteousness of papistic doctrine? Certainly not because men issued a manifesto that we call the Augsburg Confession. Whence did Luther derive the right to condemn the proclamation of the medieval Church as non-*kerygma* and as non-Gospel? Certainly not from the pronouncements of the Church which preached this false doctrine. Whence comes our authority to pronounce a *damnamus* upon the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper? Certainly not because Luther wrote his words upon a table. With what do we oppose the vagaries with which the sects, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, seek to make inroads upon our members? Certainly not with the fact that we call ourselves Lutherans and that they have assumed a different name. Whence stems our witness against the materialism of Communism and against our contemporary secular culture? Certainly only because with Jesus and Paul we can say: *gegraptai*, "It is written." Why quote and adduce Bible passages at all if thereby we do not confess that Scripture is given also for the purpose of suppressing unbelief, and unbelief in every form, that Scripture alone offers us the criterion by which we know what is of the Spirit and what is of the flesh? Is that an enslavement? Yes, indeed, Satan is to be trodden underfoot, but not only when he endeavors to mislead us to adultery, but also when he says: "Yea, hath God said?" But this obedience, by which we submit to Scripture, this crucifying of the old Adam according to the prescription of Scripture, does not flow from a spirit of enslaving fear but from the spirit of freedom, which says: *Abba, dear Father, I delight to do Thy will.*

In this connection another observation should be made. Is it not true that the Lutheran Church in some sections is no longer able to be obedient to Christ in all things because the equation of the Word of God and Scripture has been surrendered? The result is that all discipline of doctrine becomes impossible. How is it possible that fundamental doctrines of the Lutheran Confessions, yea, of Christian faith, can be flouted with impunity? Why is such an aberration passed over as *berechtigtes Anliegen* (an individual's privilege)? Is it not to a great extent for the reason that by the

surrender of Scripture as the Word of God we have lost every right to condemn unbelief? (Cf. the vagaries of Bultmann.)

3. The word "obedience" leads us to another contrast between Word and Scripture that is often advanced. It is asserted that the Word results in the *certitudo* (certainty) of a spirit-worked faith; in Scripture, if it is equated with the Word of God, the *securitas* (security) of human sight and demonstrable proof is sought. This contrast is based on false presuppositions regarding the origin of the Scriptures.

Many of the proponents of this antithesis indeed believe that Scripture is more than a human book. It is divine in origin in that they understand and accept the inspiration of Scripture as a miraculous operation and intervention of God. But they declare that when the Word of Scripture is equated with the Word of God, this miracle is reduced to a human theory which explains and eliminates the miracle and makes it "earth-bound" and "material." Those who identify Word of God and Scripture are accused of rationalizing the miracle of inspiration through a "theory" of inspiration. It is said: You no longer believe; you demonstrate.

It is no doubt true that expressions have been used by such as uphold the full authority of Scripture which may have given occasion for this criticism. But the miracle of inspiration does not become something demonstrable by this so-called theory of inspiration. On the contrary, the miracle is raised to a higher power, if it is at all permissible to speak of greater and smaller miracles.

First, however, we must ask: What is a "theory" of inspiration? If the claim of those who hold that Scripture, on the one hand, is indeed the actual words of men, and, on the other, that these words of men through the miracle of inspiration have become the infallible Word of God, is called a theory, what about those who deny this infallibility of Scripture? Is it true that they do not put forth any theory in their explanation of how the Scriptures came into existence? They certainly do, for their theory is as follows: The inspiration of the authors did not take place with the result of infallibility; the inspiration affected the writers only partly so that human frailty and error was not excluded in the product of their labors.

Since this latter theory is often bolstered with the words: "We

have these treasures in earthen vessels" (2 Cor. 4:7), it may help to clarify the situation if we contrast these two theories by means of the following parable, although the passage in which these words occur does not deal with Scripture or inspiration at all. The one theory could then be described as follows: When God proceeded to give His holy and gracious will expression in permanent form, He poured the clean and unadulterated water of His revelation into an earthen vessel. This vessel, however, was not a perfect medium. It had bad cracks so that much of the pure water which was poured into it was not retained but escaped. Furthermore, in this vessel of human media there was a sediment of impurity so that the pure water was clouded and rendered partly impure. As a result we cannot say that we have the water in its unadulterated purity. On the contrary, it must be filtered by us of its impurities.

The other theory says: Yes, the vessel has cracks and a sediment of impurity, but when God proceeded to pour His pure water into it, He effected at the same time that the vessel became watertight for His purpose and that no admixture with impurity took place. To put it differently: God did not permit Himself to be frustrated in His purpose of bringing His Word of complete truth to men because only imperfect media were at His command, but He accomplished that which He had determined to do: to bring His truth in unadulterated and complete form to men in spite of the shortcomings of the human media.

That in brief describes the two theories. If we wish to speak of the process of inspiration at all as a "theory," it certainly is clear that the one view deserves the term theory as well as the other.

But the claim is made that, in order to maintain this theory of pure water in an impure medium, we must resort to a harmonization of Scripture which operates with human and not divine logic, which rationalizes, which demonstrates *ad oculos*.

Again the question must be raised: Is a harmonization involved in only the one theory? The answer can only be: No, a harmonization is necessary to maintain both positions. What is the difference?

To get at the basic principles involved, we must begin with the claim of Scripture "Thus saith the Lord." What do we do with this claim? If we let it stand as it reads — unharmonized — then we have the obligation of accepting everything thus spoken as true

and authoritative. Hence we must seek to understand how the individual words of this Word are in harmony with one another.

This task extends into many areas. To it belong the problem of the original text and all the questions involved in textual criticism; the quotations of the Old Testament in the New Testament; the factual and logical statements of verse and verse, which apparently are not consistent with one another; the comparison of Biblical and secular history; the statements of Scripture and the pronouncements of science in all areas; the language, especially in the Old Testament, which offends the sensibilities of many; the apparently low level of morality of the imprecatory Psalms; the questions raised by isagogical investigation; the question regarding the Canon; etc.

What ridicule and scorn have been heaped upon the harmonization of these assumed contradictions! Again it is true that explanations of these problems have been given which are not valid and which at times even appear ridiculous. Nor do we want to blink the fact that this harmonization of word and word of Scripture is beset at times with seemingly insurmountable difficulties. There are questions which we must answer quite honestly by saying: *Ignoramus*, we do not know as yet how this is to be understood or solved.

But at this point we are not interested in establishing how many of these problems can be solved to everyone's satisfaction and how many still remain unsolved. To seek and find these solutions is and must remain the task of Biblical study.

We do have before us, however, the basic question: Is a harmonization employed to uphold only the theory of the pure water in the impure vessel? What do the proponents of the other theory do with the claim "Thus saith the Lord"? Is it not true that they, too, take recourse to a harmonization? It differs from the other harmonization in this, that with one fell swoop all of Scripture is harmonized. With what? The answer certainly must be: with the *securitas* of human thinking and not with the *certitudo* of faith. Because men are convinced by human thinking that the words "Thus saith the Lord" are not literally true, all pronouncements of Scripture which one does not understand on the basis of human investigation or which in some cases are also put into antithesis

against one another without cause are harmonized with the theory of the imperfect media of revelation. After one has judged the pronouncements of Scripture according to this criterion and has brought them into harmony with human thinking, one can say: This is pure water because I have removed the impurities.

In this connection another question arises: Does the acceptance of pure water in impure vessels require a *sacrificium intellectus*? The answer, on the one hand, is No. The revelation of God is not irrational in this sense, e. g., that we are no longer permitted to count to ten when earthly things are enumerated or when Scripture gives data involving numbers. But is it not true that many serious errors have been made in the name of the human *intellectus* in the judging of Scripture? How many pages of Biblical history, for example, have not been excised from Scripture merely because human investigation at that stage of historical research was unable to verify these statements of Scripture, only to gather these pages again from the wastebasket of myth and legend and to reinsert them into Scripture as accepted history!

And yet it is also true that we sacrifice the sovereignty of all human thinking when we acknowledge the truth of Scripture by which we are saved. Faith is irrational only in the sense that it cannot prove or demonstrate itself. The *sacrificium intellectus* of faith is indeed a burnt offering, which consumes us in our entire thinking and feeling, but it is also a thank offering, because in sincere gratitude toward God we accept everything that God has revealed to us in Scripture in order that we might know Him and His grace in Christ Jesus. We surrender to Him the decision as to what we are to know and not to know as necessary for our salvation.

What finally and in the last analysis is at issue? The writer of one of the articles in Schreiner's book would like to eliminate the catalogs of vice (*Lasterkataloge*) of the Old Testament from Scripture as the Word of God because they offend the modern Christian. If we are honest and place our hands into our bosom of flesh and blood, what still remains to us the greatest vice of Scripture? The answer is John 3:16. In the very heart of the Gospel message we still must struggle with the temptation, "Yea, hath God said?"

It is incorrect, then, to say: the Word produces the *certitudo* of faith. If, however, we identify the Word with Scripture, then we

are seeking a *securitas* of human sight. This antithesis is not justified. Nor does it solve the fundamental issue; in fact, it raises new problems. It creates the dilemma that we no longer know: Is this the voice of Esau or of Jacob that we hear?

If we have thus far set forth valid distinguishing features of the Word of Scripture and the Word made flesh, we have taken the first step in establishing the relationship of these two concepts to each other. But the simple fact that both may be and are represented by the same vocable should make it clear that we must think of them also as existing in a relationship of

II

ANALOGY

To some extent this analogy has already been formulated negatively in the first part. There remains, however, the task of stating this analogy *e contrario* in precise, positive terms. In doing so we must first guard against establishing a relationship that involves

A. A False Analogy

The relationship of the Word made flesh and the Word of Scripture cannot be based on an unqualified identity of the "human element" of both. The "human side" of Scripture is not analogous to the human nature of Jesus Christ to the extent that the constituent elements and factors of the one can also be found in the other.

Such a violation of the intended *tertium comparationis* of this analogy is involved in one of the major arguments against the infallibility of the Word of Scripture as the Word of God. It is said: Scripture was written by fallible men; hence it cannot be exempt from error because Jesus also was a man.

There is indeed an element of coincidence in the fact that the Word of Scripture was spoken and written by men in the flesh and that the eternal Word became flesh and dwelt among men. But before we can establish to what extent this similarity of circumstance permits us to draw parallels between the two concepts, we must be sure that in the equation (human side of Scripture = human nature of Jesus) we have valid concepts on both sides of the equal sign. For the fallacy of this equation, as and if it is used to disprove the equation: Word of God = Word of Scripture, con-

sists not so much in the equal sign but in false ballast with which at least one of the concepts is weighted as it is thrown into the balance. If concept "A" represents an invalid assumption, then the statement A = B cannot be true.

The Christological basis of this analogy is evident.⁴ The pivot upon which it turns is the human nature of Christ. Only after this term has been clearly defined will it be possible to determine the validity of the comparison and the conclusion regarding Scripture drawn from it.

When we ask: "Who and what is Jesus Christ?" a part of the correct answer is: "He is true man." It is charged, however, that the full equation of the Word of Scripture with the Word of God fails to do justice to this doctrine of the incarnation: it lapses into the old heresy of docetism. Almost every recent publication contains this challenge: "You must take the incarnation seriously." (Cf. e. g., Kittel's *Woerterbuch*, s. v. "logos" and Schreiner, *op. cit.*). The same thought is expressed by Heinrich Vogel in his *Christologie*, p. 375: "What else is possible but that the Word (of Scripture) should be found in His (Jesus') form?"

But to take the incarnation seriously, according to the same point of view, also demands making Jesus subject to human fallibility, at least in matters of purely human judgment. A completely infallible Jesus, it is said, negates the incarnation: Jesus is and remains God in the phantom form of a human body. Vogel says on p. 335: "The human thinking of him, who became one of us, is in its being joined with the Word of God, subject to the law of human thinking."⁵ Therefore, by analogy, to say that the infallible Word of God is to be identified with Word of Scripture is also docetism. It posits God in the phantom body of a human alphabet: the words of Scripture can no longer actually be the words spoken by men.

Since, in the case of many theologians, this view of the incarnation is not intended to be a summary denial of Jesus as "the Way,

⁴ The doctrine of the person of Christ was central to the 12 papers read and discussed at Bad Boll. The general topic was "Die Kirche in christologischer Schau" (The Church viewed Christologically).

⁵ Das menschliche Denken dessen, in dem Gott einer von uns wurde, ist als das mit dem Worte Gottes geeinte Denken dem Gesetz menschlichen Denkens unterworfen.

the Truth, and the Life," the question quite naturally arises: How far and to what areas does this possibility of erring on the part of the Word made flesh extend? There apparently is no uniform answer to this question. In the main the usual reply is that we are dealing here with quite harmless mistakes, for, it is said, to be in error and to sin certainly are not synonymous.

Thus the thinking of Jesus is portrayed as limited by the erroneous and imperfect historical knowledge which He shared with His contemporaries. He designated as historical events which were regarded as actual history by everyone in His day, e. g., Jonah, the Queen of Sheba; in fact, all narration in the Old Testament is elevated by Him into the realm of the historical. If Jesus had lived today, He would not have spoken as He did, for He would have had the benefit of modern historical research, which has shown that what the Old Testament presents as history is largely legend, fable, myth.

Similarly Jesus, we are reminded, did not push beyond the horizons and the contemporary view regarding the origin of the Old Testament books. He still says: "Moses saith" and "Isaiah saith." Living today, He would have been benefited by modern isagogical studies and would have been in a position to make more adequate statements on the authorship of the Old Testament books. Whether He Himself knew any better, or whether He merely accommodated Himself to the prevalent erroneous notions of His contemporaries, is of little consequence in the final analysis.

But these mistakes are said not to be serious or dangerous; they do not negate or annul the validity of the actual message of revelation. The truth of God exists in spite of these few inconsequential errors. The information and the proclamation that Jesus brings regarding God and His holy and gracious will is not shot through with human errors; it remains revelation from the bosom of the Father.

The sad fact is that such a view of what Jesus knew and did not know need not be limited to such harmless mistakes. Once a Jesus capable of error is posited, who and what is to prevent anyone from denying the claim to truth of any and all words of this fallible man? This is exactly what Vogel, for example, does when he says: "His thoughts, words, and sentences of truth as such are not

as yet the truth," p. 340. In other words, the errors to which Jesus was subject are not only of a technical nature; the very words in which He expresses Himself do not represent the truth. At this point truth begins to take flight into the fog of mysticism. The incarnation is volatilized into a "logothemism," as Baillie points out in his book *God Was in Christ*, a theism which is pure *Schwaermerei*. This is, indeed, docetism in its most violent form. But why not? Who will deny Vogel the right to take this next step, once we have agreed that Jesus is a fallible man?

And, finally, who, on this basis, has an answer for men like Eduard von Hartmann when he insists that error is not harmless but dangerous? Because Jesus was not safeguarded against error, His teaching was in many respects deleterious. Says Hartmann in his *Christentum des N.T.*: "Jesus was a man . . . who was endowed with a rather unusual mental capacity but also was a man of great intellectual defects; he was filled with a noble and sublime spirituality, but also subject to many dangerous errors and to far-reaching human frailty (e.g., his disregard of work or labor, of property, or family duties)."

Few indeed are the theologians who stoop to such blasphemy of Jesus and such desecration of His Word. But who is able to stop these blaspheming mouths if one accepts the premise: One must take the incarnation seriously; that is, Jesus was capable of error?

The fact of the matter is that Scripture gives no indication of witnessing to a *Logos* made flesh who is fallible like man. Least of all does He Himself distinguish between such words of His as are of divine origin and such as are produced merely as the result of the thinking of His human mind. The question of the Pharisees "Who are You?" He answers thus: "Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning. I have many things to say and to judge of you, but He that sent Me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of Him" (John 8:25, 26). Also: "But now ye seek to kill Me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God; this did not Abraham" (John 8:40). And again: "He that loveth Me not keepeth not My sayings, and the Word which ye hear is not Mine but the Father's that sent Me . . . but the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost . . . shall teach

you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you" (John 14:24, 26).

Vogel would not have come to his faulty conclusion regarding the fallibility of Jesus if he had remained consistent in his portrayal of the human nature of Jesus. His main thesis on the existence of Jesus in a bodily form is the following: "As to the humanity of Him in whom God became one with us, it is the humanity of one existing in the reality of a human form, subject to the necessities and functions of the body, born bodily, crucified and raised bodily, but in such a manner that the use of His body is determined by the work which He came to perform" (p. 317). Well stated. But when he treats of the human mental capacities of the divine *Logos* in this human body, it is significant to note that he omits the last clause and does not say: "In this manner that the use of his mind and intellect is determined by the work which He came to perform." The human nature that He assumed, also in its mental capacities, had the one purpose of accomplishing our salvation. It is true that we read of Him that He grew in wisdom and knowledge. But He did not have to take a course in psychology, for He knew "what was in man." He grew in wisdom, but He did not have to major in jurisprudence, for He is equipped with judicial knowledge and insight so complete that He can render judgment on the eternal fate of all men appearing before His judgment seat. He did not know when the Judgment Day would come by a self-imposed limitation of the knowledge that was His as the Son of God. But when He does make statements about Judgment Day, they are correct. By what process of human thinking does He know that the words of verdict on that day will be: Inherit the kingdom prepared for you; depart into eternal destruction? We must beware, then, lest we separate the human knowledge of Jesus from the soteriological purpose of His coming. If we approach this question from the point of view of human anthropology or psychology, we are prone to repeat the fatal mistake that the Pharisees made when they said: "If this Man were a prophet, He would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth Him" (Luke 7:39).

It cannot be maintained, then, that the human side of Scripture is analogous to the human nature of Jesus in this respect, that

neither is exempt from human error. "A" is not equal to "B" because what "B" represents is a fallacy. Whether Scripture contains errors is a question which cannot be solved by appealing to the incarnation of the eternal *Logos*.

This analogy exists, but only to this extent: As Jesus was a true man, so the authors of Scripture were and remained true human beings also under the influence of God's inspiration; they did not turn into lifeless machines and unthinking automatons; they were speaking, thinking human beings, different from one another in temperament, style, vocabulary, and other idiosyncrasies. To enable these human beings, speaking in their own vocabulary, also to speak the Word of God, God performed the miracle of inspiration, the *inverbatio*. In the eternal *Logos* made man, and as man revealing God to us and reconciling us with God, we are confronted with the miracle of the incarnation.

At this point mention could be made of a few other incorrect analogies that are often drawn between the *Logos ensarkos* and the *logos graptos*. It is said, e. g.: "Is it not true that we must think of our whole theology as a *theologia crucis*? Hence Jesus and the Scripture must be viewed under the sign of the Cross (*unter dem Zeichen des Kreuzes*)."¹ Or again: "In Jesus we have God making Himself known and also concealing and obscuring Himself (*eine Enthüllung und Verhüllung*); so God's revelation in Scripture is also clothed in the concealing and obscuring of the letter of the Word; the Word (singular) is concealed and obscured in the words."² These and similar statements, however, are based on the same half-truths that we found in the claim: Scripture has a human side because Jesus was a true man, and therefore they need no separate refutation.

B. The Correct Analogy

What then is the correct analogy between these two concepts, both of which are designated by the same term *logos*? It is this: the *Logos ensarkos* and the *logos graptos* both are God's Word of revelation. God speaks in His Son and in Scripture to accomplish my salvation.

In reality these two acts of divine revelation are in a relationship to each other that transcends all analogies of human thinking. God's Word never is the speaking of men. We must, therefore,

beware lest we seek to analyze this Word of God much as we break up a drop of water into its component parts of hydrogen and oxygen in their proper balance of two to one. If we subtract the eternal *Logos* from Scripture as its Author, Content, and life-giving Power, then we lose both. If we attempt to isolate a *logos ensarkos* for ourselves, divorced from the witness of Scripture, then we are again putting asunder what God hath joined together.

What does God say to make my salvation possible when He speaks in the *Logos ensarkos* and the *logos graptos*? In the incarnation God speaks in order to put into execution the eternal council of His love at that *kairos* in human time and in the manner determined by Him. God speaks before and after the incarnation in the Word and words uttered and written by human beings, also in His own determined manner, in order to bring to men the good news of this eternal plan of redemption and its accomplishment, and in order to create in men the faith which accepts this accomplished salvation through the power with which He has invested these words.

Since it is God speaking to us for this purpose, it certainly is not within our privilege to ask in either case: Why does God speak thus and not in some other way? If in the first instance we ask concerning the incarnation with Anselm: "Cur Deus homo?" (Why did God become man?) in order to prove by human logic that Jesus necessarily had to be and act as He did, then we expose ourselves to the danger of wanting to be as God and to solve the mystery of His love. Likewise we should not usurp the right to sit in judgment upon the manner in which God determined to bring to us the *mysterion tou euaggeliou* (Eph. 6:20) in the written Word. As far as we can see, God could have arranged to let one man speak it all. He could have had it written in one style and vocabulary. He could have dictated it. It was within His prerogative not to have it written at all but to have this message brought to us from time to time by angelic messengers. But may I presume to ask: "Cur logos graptos?" Certainly not if thereby I mean to take exception to the manner in which God speaks to me. For as according to God's counsel there is no salvation outside of the *Logos* made flesh, so there is no *Logos* for me outside Scripture.

Dr. Hugo Odeberg in *Christus und die Schrift* stresses this rela-

tionship of the Gospel and Scripture: "Everything that the Gospel contains is something which happened 'according to the Scripture.'" As an example he points to 1 Corinthians 15 and continues: "In 1 Cor. 15:1-11 Paul gives a comprehensive presentation of how the Gospel is preached. . . . But in every fundamental point in this basic instruction from the Gospel we have the words which are constantly repeated as something essential: 'according to the Scripture.' . . . That all these things happened according to the Scriptures belongs to the real essentials of the Gospel."

It is at three decisive points that the written Word and the incarnate Word are congruent as God's speaking to man.

1. Man does not know how he can be liberated from the power of sin, how he can escape the curse of God which rests upon sin, how he can find a gracious God. God speaks in the incarnation of the *Logos* his Word of Reconciliation and Redemption. Man knows nothing authentic of the meaning of this *Logos* made flesh. God speaks in the human words of Scripture His Word which makes man wise unto salvation.

2. Furthermore, when God speaks, He does not speak empty sounds but creative words. Hence the second analogy consists in this: As the incarnate *Logos* is not an impotent, ineffectual Word, but the living Victor over sin, death, and hell, so the words which His Holy Spirit inspired men to speak and write are not hollow, fleeting semantic symbols or dead letters but living instruments of the power of God, creating and preserving saving faith.

We know that the incarnate Word fulfilled the purpose for which God spoke this Word, for God did not repudiate the cry of victory from the cross: "It is finished." The Church confesses this victory when she says: "The third day He rose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

In like manner, Scripture contains not merely the neutral words of information and witness regarding the incarnate Word. Because it is also God who spoke this Word by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and by it still speaks to men, it is a Word alive with divine power. It is capable of putting into effect God's design in speak-

ing it. It overcomes the perversion of the natural mind. It penetrates the deaf ears of unbelief and enables man to hear and accept His Word of Reconciliation.

The disciples on the way to Emmaus experienced the power of this written Word as it was opened to them by the incarnate Word. What happened when Jesus revealed Himself to them by means of the written Word of Scripture? They said: "Did not our heart burn within us while He talked with us by the way and while He opened to us the Scriptures?" (Luke 24:32.) The Word of Scripture sets on fire; its flame burns into the heart.

The Apostles, by their proclamation of the Gospel, also show their conviction that the Word of Scripture is a living power. Odeberg stresses this fact as follows: "One would expect that they [the Apostles] would have much to say about the wonderful experiences that they had had. It was indeed something very extraordinary that they had experienced. But as Christ, when He set out to explain the meaning of the resurrection, did not speak of His own experience but rather of what the Scriptures say, so they, too, make their point of departure the written Scripture. The proclamation of Christ *after* His resurrection and His going to the Father corresponds to the proclamation regarding Him *before* His coming into this world (cf. the Book of Acts)." Philip, for example, does not say to the Ethiopian: "Put this old dead Scripture aside, and listen to something new that I have experienced and want to tell you"; he preaches Christ from Scripture. Paul, arraigned before Festus, bases "his hope toward God and a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust," not on a new proclamation but believes "all things which are written in the Law and in the Prophets" (Acts 24:14, 15). Every reader of Scripture knows that Scripture witnesses to itself as such a living Word.

3. God speaks in the incarnate Word and in the Word of Scripture a Word that is not heard and accepted by all. Hence we can establish this final analogy: As no man can call the *Logos ensarkos* Lord but by the Holy Ghost, so no man can call Scripture the Word of God but by the Holy Ghost. What God speaks to men in the incarnate and the written Word can be heard and accepted only by the ears of faith.

The Church confesses: I believe that Jesus Christ is my Lord.

It makes this confession only because it consists of the fellowship of believers. Everyone who makes this confession has thereby surrendered all claim to his own lordship and right of self-determination. Because the believer knows that his contradiction to God is resolved by his communion with God through Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh no longer is a contradiction for him. But this faith in the Word made flesh that God has spoken to the believer and permitted him to hear cannot be demonstrated logically or empirically.

In the same way, it is only a Spirit-wrought faith that can say: God has spoken and is speaking His saving Word to me in the written Word. That assurance is not man-made. It is not produced by logical proof, deductions, or historical verification.

Human demonstrations of truth need not be put into opposition to faith. They have their place, above all in the apologetic of Scripture. But when the believer refutes the charges that Scripture contains logical contradictions and historical inaccuracies, he does so merely because the attack on Scripture is in this area. He should not be accused of making the validity of divine truth dependent on the processes of reason. Nor does such an apologetic betray a small, insecure faith that needs to be bolstered.

But to say: "I believe in Scripture as the Word of God" is a statement of faith no less than to say: "I believe in Jesus Christ, God's Son and my Savior." When the Holy Spirit through the Word of Scripture creates saving faith in Jesus Christ, then the believer also hears these written Words as the speaking of God for his salvation.

The net result appears to be an argument in a circle: I believe in Jesus Christ because I believe in Scripture; I believe in Scripture because I believe in Jesus Christ. But this circle does not affect me as a *circulus vitiosus*. It exists because it has a center about which it revolves: Jesus Christ, my Savior. The lines that issue from this center in the words of Scripture form and preserve the circle. Without this center there would be no circle of faith; without the radii from the circumference I would miss the center.

The Word is in the Word.

"Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth."

St. Louis, Mo.

The Covenant of Blood

BY PAUL G. BRETSCHER

III

THE BLOOD OF REDEMPTION

In both the Old Testament and the New the idea of redemption is closely related to that of atonement. Redemption is simply another picture of salvation, another facet in the diamond of God's gracious covenant with fallen man.

Two words are used in the Hebrew, almost equally often, to signify redemption. They are *gaal* and *padab*. A number of passages in which both words occur give evidence that they are to be regarded as synonyms. For instance:

Jer. 31:11: The Lord hath redeemed [*padab*] Jacob, and ransomed [*gaal*] him from the hand of him that was stronger than he.

Hos. 13:14: I will ransom [*padab*] them from the power of the grave; I will redeem [*gaal*] them from death.

Lev. 27:27: If it be of an unclean beast, then he shall redeem [*padab*] it according to thine estimation, . . . or if it be not redeemed [*gaal*], then it shall be sold.

Is. 35:9, 10: . . . the redeemed [*padab*] shall walk there: and the ransomed [*gaal*] of the Lord shall return.

Mention should also be made of a third verb, *qanah*. This is the common Hebrew word meaning to "buy," or "purchase." In a few passages it is used with a definite religious significance, as an additional synonym for *gaal* and *padab*. Thus, for instance, in Moses' song of deliverance, Ex. 15:13, 16:

Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth the people which Thou hast redeemed [*gaal*] . . . till Thy people pass over which Thou hast purchased [*qanah*].

See also Ps. 74:2:

Remember Thy congregation, which Thou hast purchased [*qanah*] of old; the rod of thine inheritance, which Thou hast redeemed [*gaal*].

One other word of interest here is the noun *kopher*, usually translated as "ransom." Notice that *kopher* is one of the noun forms

of *kaphar*, "to make an atonement," with which we dealt in the previous chapter. *Kopher*, however, probably derives its meaning from the original sense of *kaphar*, "to cover." Thus the "ransom" is a "covering," much in the sense in which we today put up collateral to "cover" a loan. For our present purpose, it is most important to note that *kopher*, wherever used, signifies the payment of a price. Thus, see:

Prov. 6:35: A jealous man "will not regard any ransom [*kopher*], neither will he rest content, though thou givest many gifts."

Job 36:18, 19: Because there is wrath, beware lest He take thee away with His stroke; then a great ransom [*kopher*] cannot deliver thee. Will He esteem thy riches? No, not gold, nor all the forces of thy strength.

The *redemption* idea, like that of *atonement*, plays a prominent part in Old Testament Ceremonial Law. It is not necessary for us here to define the complexities of the laws regarding various redemptions. Let us look briefly, however, at a few points that do serve our present purpose.

The first, and religiously most significant, of all redemptions is that of the first-born of men and the firstlings of animals. This is defined for the first time in Ex. 13:2, 11-15:

Sanctify unto Me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the Children of Israel, both of man and of beast. It is Mine. . . .

Thou shalt set apart unto the Lord all that openeth the matrix and every firstling that cometh of a beast which thou hast; the males shall be the Lord's.

And every firstling of an ass [unclean] thou shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck; and all the first-born of man among thy children shalt thou redeem.

And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him. . . .

. . . when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man and the first-born of beast. Therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all that openeth the matrix, being males; but all the first-born of my children I redeem.

Note the following: (1) The life of all first-born males of men and of animals in Israel is regarded as forfeit. Thus it is evident that the Children of Israel were spared the curse of the tenth plague in Egypt, not because they were good and undeserving of death and judgment, but only because the mercy of God planned redemption for them. (2) Israel is forever to be aware that because of their sin their lives are just as forfeit before God as were the lives of those slain in Egypt; they have no right to live. (3) This remembrance is symbolized in the law of *redemption*. The first-born male of any clean animal is to be sacrificed to God. It must die. The first-born male of any unclean animal, such as the ass, must either be redeemed by the death of a lamb for it, or must die by breaking its neck (no shedding of blood here because this cannot be a sacrificial death). The first-born children of men must be redeemed. The manner of this latter redemption is not clearly stated here. The implication at this point seems to be that the first-born son is also redeemed by the death of a lamb or by some other sacrifice. Later, in the Law of Sinai, God takes for Himself the Levites instead of the first-born of all Israel to serve as His priesthood and in His Tabernacle (Num. 3:12, 13). Under this new arrangement the first-born sons of the rest of Israel are now redeemed by money (five shekels, Num. 3:45-51), the money to be used for the service of the sanctuary. The payment of this redemption money was involved when the parents of Jesus brought Him to the Temple to present Him to the Lord and "to do for Him after the custom of the Law" (Luke 2:22, 23, 27). Detailed regulations on this redemption ceremony may be found in Num. 8:17-19; 18:15-17.

Precise legal terms are laid down in the Law also for other redemptions: redemption of fields (Lev. 25:23-34); redemption of men who in poverty have sold themselves into slavery (Lev. 25:47-55); avenging ("redeeming," *gaal*) of blood by slaying the murderer (Num. 35:11, 12, 19, 30-33). In connection with the law of blood vengeance on a murderer, it is definitely stipulated that "ye shall take no satisfaction [*kopher*, "ransom"] for the life of a murderer which is guilty of death . . . the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it."

Without discussing in detail any of these redemptions, there is one clear thought in all of them with an intense bearing on our subject—*redemption* inherently, in the very meaning of the word (cf., above, the relation of *kopher* and *qanah* to *gaal* and *padah*), always involves a price. Perhaps the price is a sacrifice, as of a lamb, or the payment of money, or the death of the murderer, but always there is a price to be paid. Always redemption costs something.

Now let us turn specifically to the many passages in which God is called the Redeemer of His people. Are we justified, then, in reading into every use of the name Redeemer, the idea that it costs God something to save man? I hold that this is a very necessary implication of the very word. To be sure, there are a number of passages in which this sense is obscured, in which God's redemption of His people is attributed not to the payment of a price, but to a simple act of His power:

Ex. 6:6: I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments.

Ex. 15:13, 16: Thou in Thy mercy hast led forth the people which Thou hast redeemed; Thou hast guided them in Thy strength unto Thy holy habitation. . . . Fear and dread shall fall upon them; by the greatness of Thine arm they shall be as still as a stone, till Thy people pass over, O Lord, till the people pass over, which Thou hast purchased [*qanah*].

Ps. 77:14, 15: Thou art the God that doest wonders; Thou hast declared Thy strength among the people. Thou hast with Thine arm redeemed Thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph.

1 Chron. 17:21: And what one nation in the earth is like Thy people Israel, whom God went to redeem to be His own people, to make Thee a name of greatness and terribleness, by driving out nations from before Thy people, whom Thou hast redeemed out of Egypt?

It will be seen that these passages all refer to a deliverance in which the power of God was most strikingly manifested, specifically the deliverance from Egypt. Yet even here the word "redeem" carries the implication that God must pay some price in order to be the God of mercy to this sinful and rebellious nation and in order that He may use His power for them, not

to destroy them. (See especially the words "in thy mercy" and "purchased" in the Exodus 15 passage above.)

There are other passages in which God's redemption is specifically associated with the idea of a price which God must pay.

Ps. 74:2: Remember Thy congregation, which Thou hast purchased [*qanab*] of old; the tribe of Thine inheritance, which Thou hast redeemed [*gaal*].

Is. 43:1-3: Fear not; for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art Mine. . . . For I am the Lord, Thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Savior. I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. Since thou wast precious in My sight, thou hast been honorable, and I have loved thee; therefore will I give men for thee and people for thy life.

The interpretation of this passage is difficult. It may refer to some obscure political situation in which the nations around Israel fall victim to conquest, yet Israel herself is spared. In any case, this much is clear, that the payment of a price is implicit in words "redeem" and "ransom."

A most striking passage showing that man's redemption is finally a redemption from death and that the price is higher than any man can dream of paying is Ps. 49:6-15:

They that trust in their wealth and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem [*padab*] his brother nor give to God a ransom [*kopber*] for him (for the redemption of their soul [i. e., life] is precious, and it ceaseth forever), that he should still live forever and not see corruption.

The next few verses poetically depict the hopelessness of every human attempt to escape death. Then the climax (v. 15):

But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave [*sheol*]; for He shall receive me.

Thus it is evident that the price of the redemption of the life of man from the death to which it is subject by virtue of sin is far higher than any man can pay. There is only One who can pay that price — God, into whose hands the Psalmist confidently commits himself and in whom he finds victory over "the power of the grave."

What the price is that God must pay for the redemption of the

sinner becomes clear only in the light of the fulfillment. This is not to say, however, that God's people in the Old Testament knew or could know nothing of it. The very *protevangelium* (Gen. 3:15) suggests it. That Seed of the woman, through whom one day the head of the serpent will be crushed and his victory over man snatched away from him, that Seed must also be bitten on the heel by the serpent. He must suffer in Himself all that man suffers through the venom of the devil, including temptation, pain, sweat, suffering, and finally death; for only through such suffering will He win for man the victory.

Clearest of all Old Testament passages, however, on the price of God's redemption of man from sin and death is that found in Isaiah 52 and 53. Here are the highlights of these beautiful redemption passages, which show that the price of redemption is the death of God's elect Servant. The price is blood, and therefore the covenant of redemption belongs to the covenant of blood.

Is. 52:3: Thus saith the Lord, Ye have sold yourselves for nought; and ye shall be *redeemed* without money.

Vv. 9, 10: Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord hath comforted His people. He hath *redeemed* Jerusalem. The Lord hath made bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.

Vv. 13, 15: Behold, My Servant . . . shall sprinkle many nations. . . .

Such sprinkling is the sprinkling of blood, as in Ex. 24:8. The blood of animals sprinkles one nation only. The blood which the Servant sprinkles shall be of universal benefit, for He shall sprinkle "many nations."

Then comes chapter 53, all of which is relevant for our purposes, but we shall comment on only a few phrases.

Vv. 4-6: Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows . . . and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.

Just as the iniquities and transgressions were laid on the head of the sacrificial animal (Lev. 1:4) or on the head of the scapegoat (Lev. 16:21, 22), so the Servant becomes the Substitute in sin and in death for all men.

V. 7: He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter. . . . This figure is distinct from the "sheep before her shearers," which

immediately follows. The Lamb brought to the slaughter is the lamb of sacrifice, who sheds His blood in the sin offering.

V. 10: His soul shall make an offering for sin.

The Servant becomes the Sin Offering of men by laying down His life (i.e., His soul).

V. 11: He [God] shall see of the travail of His soul [life] and shall be satisfied. . . . He shall bear their iniquities.

The sacrifice of the Servant, dying under the guilt of our sins, is acceptable to God. The redemption price is paid in full, the justice and wrath of God is satisfied.

V. 12: He hath poured out His soul [life] unto death.

The pouring out of His life contains the picture of the pouring out of the blood of the sacrifice. For in the outpouring of blood life flows away into death.

This is the price of the covenant of redemption. That price, the death of the elect Servant of God, must be read into every passage in which God is called the Redeemer of man from sin and from death. Let us look at a few:

Job 33:28: He will deliver [*padah*] his soul from going into the pit [grave], and his life shall see the light.

Job 33:24: Then He is gracious unto him and saith, Deliver [*pada*, rare variant for *padah*] him from going down to the pit. I have found a ransom [*kopher*].

Job 19:25: I know that my *Redeemer* liveth and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.

Ps. 103:4: Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction.

Hos. 13:14: I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O Death, I will be thy plagues; O Grave, I will be thy destruction.

In all the passages above we sense a mood of heartfelt relief and deepest joy. Man, who has lived in the dreadful despair and haunting horror of death, now finds salvation and life and victory—not in his own goodness, or power, or ingenuity, but in the redemption price paid for him by a wondrously merciful and

gracious God. Since the Bible so clearly teaches that death is in the world only as the summation of the consequences of man's sin, we are not surprised either to find other passages in which deliverance of man from sin is pictured as the object of redemption. Thus the following:

Ps. 130:7, 8: Let Israel hope in the Lord; for with the Lord there is mercy, and with Him is plenteous *redemption*. And He shall *redeem* Israel from all his iniquities.

Is. 44:22, 23: I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions and, as a cloud, thy sins. Return unto Me, for I have *redeemed* thee. Sing, O ye heavens; for the Lord hath done it; shout, ye lower parts of the earth. Break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein; for the Lord hath *redeemed* Jacob and glorified Himself in Israel.

Is. 59:20: The *Redeemer* shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord.

Any redemption that removes from man the curse of his sin will also have this consequence, that it wipes out the wrath of God and restores peace between man and his Creator. Thus:

Is. 54:5-10: For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of Hosts is His name; and thy *Redeemer* the Holy One of Israel. . . . For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid My face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord, thy *Redeemer*. For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed; but My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the *covenant* of My *peace* be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee" (see also Is. 63:7-9).

The full significance of the price of God's redemption becomes clear in many New Testament passages. It is quite probable that the people of Israel, reading their Old Testament Scriptures and noting the many passages in which their God is called the *Redeemer*, failed to apply to that word, in these connections, the full sense of the payment of a price. In the light of the fulfillment, however, the fact that our redemption does cost something, and that God alone, in Christ, can pay that cost, rings with brilliant clarity again and again. The price is the blood and death of the Son of God.

Matt. 20:28 (also Mark 10:45): The Son of Man came . . . to give His *life a ransom* for many.

Acts 20:28: The Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the Church of God, which He hath *purchased* with His own *blood*.

Rom. 3:24: Being justified freely by His grace through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus.

1 Cor. 6:20: For ye are *bought with a price*.

Gal. 3:13: Christ hath *redeemed* us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree.

Gal. 4:4, 5: God sent forth His Son . . . to *redeem* them that were under the Law.

Eph. 1:7: In whom we have *redemption* through His *blood*, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace (see also Col. 1:14).

1 Tim. 2:6: Who gave *Himself*, a *ransom* for all. . . .

Titus 2:14: Who gave *Himself* for us that He might *redeem* us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

Heb. 9:12: By His own blood He entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal *redemption* for us.

Heb. 9:15: By means of *death*, for the *redemption* of the transgressions.

1 Peter 1:18, 19: Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious *blood* of Christ, as of a Lamb, without blemish and without spot.

2 Peter 2:1: Even denying the Lord that *bought them*. . . .

Rev. 5:9: Thou wast slain and hast *redeemed* us to God by Thy *blood* (see also 14:3, 4).

Clearly the Apostles saw in Christ and His death the fulfillment of every prophetic reference of the Old Testament to God as the Redeemer of His people. Thus the New Testament stands on the Old. Its great concepts grow out of Old Testament concepts, even as it pours into the Old Testament the light of a salvation fully accomplished and glorious beyond the dreams of men.

IV

THE BLOOD OF CIRCUMCISION

Scripture contains not a single clear passage which directly and unmistakably draws the covenant of circumcision into the covenant of blood. Lacking such a passage we cannot know with confidence whether the people of Israel ever saw in the rite of circumcision the significance of blood which I see here or whether they drew the inferences I draw. It is evident, indeed, that in most of the history of God's people circumcision was nothing more than a habitual, routine religious work and that few, if any, performed it with a sense of any deeper significance than this, that it was the distinctive, God-given sign of God's chosen people. Nevertheless, the lack of a direct Scripture reference does not prove that the token of circumcision has no deeper meaning; indeed, our common experience with the tokens under which God offers His covenant indicates that the token itself is never only a meaningless sign, but somehow contains within itself the message of that which it signifies. If we look for such a message in the token of circumcision, we can find it at least by inference and deduction, if not by direct statement, in the covenant of blood. Since the major conclusions drawn in this chapter are confessedly deductions, I do not offer them with dogmatic certainty. Nevertheless, to me, circumcision takes on a rich spiritual beauty, entirely within the analogy of Scripture and in harmony with every Scriptural reference to circumcision when it is interpreted in the light of the covenant of blood.

The institution of the covenant of circumcision between God and Abraham is recorded in Genesis 17. See especially verses 10-14:

This is My covenant which ye shall keep, between Me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a *token* of the *covenant* betwixt Me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised. And *My covenant shall be in your flesh* for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man

child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken My covenant.

The terms of this covenant may be outlined simply: (1) It is meant for every male child born into Abraham's household as well as for every male slave bought with money; (2) the normal time of circumcision is the eighth day of a baby's life; (3) circumcision consists in cutting off the flesh of the foreskin; (4) such cutting will leave a permanent mark in the flesh of the man who is circumcised; (5) this mark in his flesh shall be to the man throughout his life the sign and *token* that he lives in a gracious covenant relationship with God; (6) submission to circumcision signifies obedience to God's command and trust in His promises. Therefore he who is not circumcised rejects God's covenant and has no part in it.

This latter point, the importance of *faith* in receiving the covenant of circumcision, is emphasized by Paul in Rom. 4:11:

[Abraham] received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.

To Paul the faith which believes in God's covenant of grace is of greater importance than the outward sign of circumcision itself. It is by such faith that Abraham attained righteousness before God. His circumcision became the *sign* and *seal* of his righteousness, that is, of his covenant relationship with God. The covenant thus works in two directions: (1) from God to man in that it carries God's gracious promise of forgiveness and victory and seals that promise in the circumcised flesh of man; (2) from man to God in that the promise and the seal are gladly and humbly received by faith. Again we could adapt Luther's explanation of the power of Baptism: "How can circumcision do such great things? Answer: It is not the outward act of circumcision, indeed, that does them, but the word of God (i. e., His command and promise), which is in and with the circumcision, and faith, which trusts such word of God in the circumcision. For without the word of God circumcision is nothing but mutilation of the flesh; but with the word of

God it is *circumcision*, that is, the token and sign and seal, in the flesh of man, of God's gracious covenant."

One other interesting passage we ought to examine before we proceed to draw the relationship between the covenant of circumcision and the covenant of blood. That is the somewhat obscure incident in the life of Moses recorded in Ex. 4:24-26. The incident occurs shortly after Moses receives his divine commission, and as he is traveling with his wife, Zipporah, and his son Gershom, to return with Aaron to Egypt.

And it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him [Moses] and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet, and said, Surely a bloody husband art thou to me. So He let him go. Then she said, A bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision.

Zipporah and Moses apparently have argued in the past over the question of circumcising their son; otherwise Zipporah would not have drawn the immediate conclusion, when Moses' life hangs in the balance, that it is on account of his failure to circumcise Gershom that God now has smitten him. Zipporah herself is repelled by the bloodiness of circumcision. Yet now, when Moses lies near death, she herself performs the act and brings the bloody foreskin to Moses, casting it at his feet in disgust to show that it has been done. The Lord lets Moses recover. Zipporah's comment indicates that she still does not understand the meaning of the act, is repelled by the bloodiness of it, and has been driven to overcome her revulsion only by the threat to Moses' life.

Of particular interest here, however, is the reference to the bloodiness of the act of circumcising. Does the real religious significance of this particular token of God to His people lie again in the shedding of blood? Is the covenant of circumcision, therefore, just another aspect of the covenant of blood? Recall again the key passage, Lev. 17:11, and let us apply it here:

The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.

"The life of the flesh is in the blood." We have already dealt with

the flesh and blood of the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament. Here, in circumcision, we deal not with the flesh and blood of animals, however, but of man himself, even as God has told Abraham, "My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." We have seen that the blood of animals has no intrinsic value to remit sin, for the animal is inferior to man and not sufficiently precious to be man's substitute in death. Then how about human sacrifice, the blood of man himself? This is an abomination to God (Deut. 12:31; 2 Kings 16:3; Ezek. 23:37-39; Micah 6:7). Furthermore, human sacrifice cannot be the *substitute* for the death of man; man cannot substitute for himself, since his life is already forfeit. Yet in circumcision it is *man's blood* that is shed—shed only in part, not to cause death, yet to remind man that his life is not his own, that he has no right to live, that death is richly deserved as the wages of sin. At the same time circumcision also contains the Gospel of God's grace. For though the blood is shed, yet man lives. He ought to die, still he does not. The one sacrifice precious enough to be a true substitute for man will yet be offered for man by God Himself. "In Him shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Throughout his life, then, the man bears in his flesh the sign and token of circumcision. It tells him that he has shed before God some of his own blood, a powerful reminder of the price he ought to pay for his sin. Yet it tells him also that God has wrought for him a wondrously merciful deliverance. This is the beauty of the covenant and its token.

The token itself is distinctive and unmistakable. No other cutting of human flesh, no other letting of human blood, could leave so clear and permanent a sign, yet without impairing any function of the body. Circumcision requires no witnesses, no records on paper, no certificates. The covenant is *in the flesh* of man for an *everlasting* covenant. Though man is circumcised on the eighth day, though he will have no personal remembrance of the act, he will nevertheless know in his own flesh that it has surely been performed. And if he knows the significance of it, his own flesh will constantly remind him that his life is forfeit by sin, yet saved by God's grace.

How about woman? We have noticed in connection with the redemption of the first-born that the laws of redemption apply

only to the male children. Here again circumcision is for the male child only. Does this mean that woman is despised and left out of God's covenant? By no means. It is the consistent view of Scripture that the woman is the helpmeet of the man, that in marriage she and the man are one flesh. The covenant signs of redemption and of circumcision are hers through her husband. At the same time the very fact that woman does not participate personally in circumcision underscores the fact that circumcision is a token of God's covenant, no more, no less. It is not the covenant itself. By its very nature, if it is a token, then it has value only if man realizes what it betokens; if it is a sign, as Paul terms it, it has value only when man is personally aware of what it signifies; if it is a seal, it becomes that only when the man believes what it seals (cf. Rom. 4:11, above). Thus again the blood that man sheds in circumcision is not the blood of his atonement essentially, no more than is the blood of the animals sacrificed on his altars. It is only the seal and token and sign of a more precious blood to come.

Three abuses of circumcision become evident in Scripture and shed additional light on circumcision itself. The first is the offense of man at its bloodiness, as typified in Zipporah, who cries to Moses, "A bloody husband thou art to me, because of the circumcision." The fact that Zipporah is thus offended indicates that she fails to see the spiritual significance of that shedding of blood. Furthermore, she does not in faith yield to God's command and trust in His promise—which she ought to have done, even if she did not understand to the full God's gracious intent. If any man is offended at the bloodiness of circumcision, let him note by contrast what an extremely high value the same God who ordains circumcision sets on the blood of man in other passages of Scripture. Recall, for instance, the words of God's covenant with Noah, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man (Gen. 9:6)." Notice also that circumcision is the only shedding of human blood that God will allow. All other cuttings of the flesh of man are condemned as an abomination unto the Lord. See, for instance:

Lev. 19:28: Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead nor print any marks upon you. I am the Lord.

1 Kings 18:28: They [the prophets of Baal] cried aloud and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets till the blood gushed out upon them (cf. also Lev. 21:5; Deut. 14:1; Jer. 16:6).

It is evident, then, that blood is highly precious in God's sight. God would not have one drop of man's blood shed unless He had a highly important reason for requiring it. To be offended at the bloodiness of circumcision, and, in fact, at the bloodiness of the Old Testament, is to fail to see the depth of human depravity, or to realize the finality of God's awful and unfailing threat: "The day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

A greater and far more common abuse of circumcision occurred when its spiritual meaning is lost. So easily circumcision became simply a religious ritual, a human performance of God's Law, which by the very outward act, *ex opere operato*, sufficed to guarantee man's eternal safety under the covenant of God. Thus man forgot that in circumcision God was giving to him a gift so precious as to make man eternally and inescapably God's debtor. Circumcision became a gift that man offers to God and for which he expects to receive the reward of obedience. Circumcision became a symbol of national pride instead of personal humility. Thus circumcision can be degraded and blasphemed by the ungodly sons of Jacob in the Dinah story, Genesis 34; or again by King Saul, who lightly commands David to bring him 100 foreskins of the Philistines as a dowry for his daughter Michal, 1 Samuel 18. It is in opposition to such worldly ideas of circumcision, such failure to appreciate its spiritual significance and to live therefore in the spirit of humble repentance and faith before God, that the many exhortations are directed to God's people to circumcize also and especially the foreskins of their hearts. Thus for example:

Deut. 10:16: Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked.

Deut. 30:6: The Lord, thy God, will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.

Jer. 9:25, 26: Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised:

Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the Children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that are in the utmost corners, that dwell in the wilderness. For all these nations are *uncircumcised*, and *all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart* (cf. also Jer. 4:4).

Rom. 2:28, 29: He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God (cf. also Col. 2:11).

The third abuse of circumcision occurred in the days of the Apostles, when Jewish teachers desired to retain it as a legal requirement even after the fulfillment had come in Christ. Circumcision, as we have seen, belongs to the shadows of things to come. The blood of circumcision inevitably fades into obscurity once there is revealed to us the full glory of the blood of the cross of Christ. To cling, then, to the ordinances of circumcision is more than simply a denial of Christian liberty. It constitutes a denial of Christ Himself — in the first place because outward conformity to Law is made an additional requirement for salvation, and so Christ is no longer the complete Savior; in the second place, because the whole significance of blood with its message of Law and Gospel is buried beneath the empty performance of an external work. The man who, seeing the token of circumcision in his own flesh, can say in repentance and faith: "My life is forfeit, I ought to die for my sin; yet God has spared my life and promised to offer another sacrifice in my stead" — that man, when he sees the death and resurrection of Christ, will readily and joyfully understand that here is the fulfillment of his salvation. He will place his whole trust now in Christ Himself and will realize that circumcision is needed now no more than are the Old Testament animal sacrifices, for the one great Sacrifice has been offered. The Jewish teachers, on the other hand, who wanted to insist that the Gentile Christians must at least be circumcised revealed by such insistence that to them circumcision was a work of man's obedience only, not a channel of God's grace. By such obedience man would merit God's favor; he would perform his part of the bargain with God and could now wait for God to reward him. Perhaps there

was also a touch of nationalistic pride in this insistence on circumcision. Desiring to glorify Israel, they forget to glorify the God of Israel.

Any such spirit is totally incompatible with the true religion of God as it comes to its climax in Jesus Christ. Paul devotes almost the entire Epistle to the Galatians to this problem. He pulls no punches. See, for instance, the stirring words in Galatians 5:

Behold, I, Paul, say unto you that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole Law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the Law; ye are fallen from grace. . . . For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love (vv. 2-6).

I would they were even cut off which trouble you [i.e., that they would mutilate themselves] (v. 12).

Or from Gal. 6:12-17:

As many as desire to make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the Law; but desire to have you circumcised that they may glory in your flesh. But God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. . . . From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body the marks [not of circumcision, but] of the Lord Jesus.

Thus, says Paul, if you want to bear in your body any mark or physical token of the fact that you are a Christian, let it be not circumcision, but rather the marks of the sufferings which you, as a new creature, have willingly endured for Christ's sake.

New Orleans, La.

(To be concluded)

Outlines on the Hannover Epistles

INVOCAVIT

1 JOHN 3:7-12

Several years ago a will was contested in Waterloo, Iowa, in which the deceased had directed that the income of \$75,000 of his estate should be distributed to persons "who believe in the fundamental principles of the Christian religion and in the Bible and who are endeavoring to promulgate the same." Ten of his nephews and nieces went to court to break the will. They said there is no common agreement as to the definition of Christianity. Clergymen of many different denominations who were called in to testify only beclouded the issue. On the question of the Virgin Birth, for example, one of them said, "I tell my people to pay their money and take their choice." Owing to the confusion, the will was broken. . . . The Bible is plain in its description of Christians. Our text offers such a

PORTRAIT OF A CHRISTIAN

I

The Christian is a person who is born again in Christ (vv. 8 b, 9 a). The Apostle had been speaking of Christians as the "sons of God" by adoption. He refers again to this new birth in v. 9: "whosoever is born of God." The basic characteristic of a Christian is his rebirth from spiritual death to spiritual life. By His redemption Christ "destroyed the works of the devil" (v. 8). The born-again Christian becomes partaker of this gift when God brings him to saving faith, covers him with Jesus' blood and righteousness, and plants his feet on the path of newness of life (2 Cor. 5:21).

II

The Christian is one who abstains from sin. This is a by-product of his rebirth. His portrait amid the darkness of this sinful world is like a Rembrandt painting: an illuminated face shining out of a dark background. "He cannot sin because he is born of God" (v. 9). He cannot persist in deliberate sin, in lawlessness against

God's will, for that would be contrary to his new nature. In saying this our text does not advance the "perfectionist theory," nor does it mean that the Christian cannot commit acts of sin. That would be contrary to 1 John 1:9, where it is made our duty to confess our sins. Also the Fifth Petition: "For we daily sin much." But with the Holy Spirit working in his heart ("His seed remaineth in him"), the regenerate person is happily disabled for a sinning life. An embargo, as it were, has been placed on his sinning powers.

III

Another mark of a Christian is that he "doeth righteousness" (v. 7). The righteousness of Christ has been imputed to him so that he has pardon, peace, and life eternal. This righteous disposition of his heart, the relation to God as a forgiven child, as it is molded by faith, is bound to express itself in righteous conduct. Righteous character and righteous practice cannot be separated any more than one can separate heat from fire. Moreover, the Christian shows the fruits of righteousness *because he is a child of God*, because "he is righteous," not because he wants to earn his way into God's good graces or be seen of men, as did the Pharisees, or measure up to accepted social standards. It is a poor kind of righteousness, a poor kind of giving which gives only because the congregation publishes a financial statement of individual gifts. It is a poor type of honesty that would not take a dime from the cash register but hedges on income tax returns. It is a poor brand of obedience which walks the narrow way when parents are watching but runs wild when they are not around. Contrariwise, a person who fails to produce righteousness and who deliberately lives in sin shows thereby that he is still a child of Satan (v. 8).

IV

A final feature of this portrait is that the Christian shows brotherly love (v. 11). Note Scripture's strong emphasis upon it in 1 John 4:21; Eph. 5:2; 1 Peter 1:22. Such love is not a carefully thought-out schedule of actions but the very outgrowth (condition of heart) of our new life in Christ . . . who first loved us. Many church members may know the "Six Chief Parts" and pull out their confirmation certificate to prove it and yet have not

advanced beyond the ABC's in the practice of love. How warmly do you radiate love in these areas: (a) toward your children? (b) husband . . . wife? (c) in office, shop, social life? (d) toward your enemies? (e) toward unconverted people?

This is the portrait of a Christian that our text draws. . . . For our many failures there is the constant forgiveness through the blood of Christ. For our steady growth there is the power of prayer and the incoming of the Holy Spirit through Word and Sacrament.

Topeka, Kans.

ALBERT C. BURROUGHS

REMINISCERE

2 COR. 7:1-12

Introduction: Not the least of the pastor's duties is that of admonishing the erring. This is an arduous task.

The one who is being admonished may be tempted to be indifferent to the warning itself or to think hard thoughts about the pastor when he is performing his duty. However, the reaction which ought to be found in the heart of the Christian when he is admonished is that of heartfelt gratitude to God for the service which his pastor is rendering him. In our text Paul encourages us to

THANK GOD FOR PASTORAL ADMONITION

- I. *Because pastoral admonition indicates a love for souls on the part of the pastor (vv. 2-7).*
- II. *Because pastoral admonition intends to lead us to godly sorrow.*

I

A. Paul had the Corinthians on his heart (v. 3).

1. Paul had founded the congregation on his second missionary journey.
2. In dealing with them he had always manifested the purest motives (v. 2).
3. Having left them, he still was concerned for their spiritual welfare (v. 5).
 - a. He had sent Titus to serve them.
 - b. He earnestly desired to hear of their welfare. He was uneasy

at not having had a report from Titus. However, he was overjoyed at hearing of their welfare (vv. 6-7).

B. Paul's very love for the Corinthians prompted him to admonish them (vv. 8 and 12).

1. A serious source of offense had arisen in the congregation. Cf. 1 Corinthians 5. One of their company was living in incest with his father's wife.

2. The congregation seems to have been remiss in disciplining the offender.

3. Paul wrote the Corinthians, urging them to deal with the offender (v. 8).

a. He wrote them sternly. Cf. 1 Corinthians 5.

b. Yet he had their spiritual welfare at heart (v. 12). His object was not primarily to deal with the offender, nor was it to vindicate the father. It was rather to indicate his caring for the Corinthians. To neglect to admonish would have been evidence of a lack of pastoral concern. His very admonition was an evidence of love. He did not want his members to become polluted by sin, nor did he want them ultimately to perish with the wicked.

C. Paul is a pastor after God's own heart. When there is sin threatening the spiritual life of the flock, Paul deals with it. His very love for the flock prompts his action. How thankful the Corinthians should have been to have a pastor like Paul.

D. No less thankful ought people today be for the admonition given by a Christian pastor.

1. Christian pastors are God-appointed watchmen over the flock, who must give an account to God for the care which they give the flock. Acts 20:28; Ezek. 3:17-21.

2. Also today the motive of the pastor in admonishing an individual is love. He is not seeking to stifle the liberty of the individual but rather he is seeking to preserve the soul of the individual from harm and from ultimate ruin.

3. Let us thank God for the admonition of a Christian pastor. Let us not become resentful if he must speak to us whenever we have not been conducting ourselves as Christians. Let us rather recognize that love for our soul prompts the pastor to speak to us.

In humility let us accept his reproof and pray the Holy Spirit's help that we may mend our ways.

II

A. Paul did not want the Corinthians to sorrow as does the world (v. 10).

1. The sorrow of the world is mere sorrow over the fact that one has made himself liable to punishment and must suffer on account of it. Cf. Cain, Judas.

2. This kind of sorrow works death because it despises the one means of help, the grace of God in Christ.

B. Paul wanted the Corinthians to have godly sorrow (vv. 9-11).

1. The sorrow of the Corinthians was of a godly kind (v. 9).

a. They recognized the seriousness of their sin as an offense against God. Cf. David in Psalm 51.

b. They showed that theirs was godly sorrow (v. 11).

2. Such godly sorrow works repentance to salvation (v. 10).

a. It not only recognizes seriousness of sin as an offense against God;

b. It also earnestly desires the one means of forgiveness: the infinite grace of God for sinners in Christ Jesus (Acts 2:37; 16:30).

c. Such godly sorrow leads the soul to salvation.

3. Their godly sorrow was a joy to the Apostle (vv. 7 and 9). His reproof had achieved the desired results.

C. How thankful the Corinthians should have been that God gave them a pastor like Paul. Christian pastors of today, when they admonish us, have the same objective in view as had Paul. They confront us with our sin in order that we may have genuine godly sorrow, that we may realize that we have sinned against the infinite love of God for us. They want us to think of our sin as Peter did when he went out into the night and wept bitterly. At the same time they would have us turn to the grace of God which calls to penitent sinners: "Come now and let us reason together . . . though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."

D. Let us therefore thank God for the admonition given by

a Christian pastor. Let us not despise his warnings. Let us rather accept them in a spirit of meekness. Viewing our sin with godly sorrow, let us humbly confess our sin to God, take refuge in His forgiving grace in Christ Jesus, put our sin from us, and perfect holiness in the fear of God.

If such is our sorrow, then God Himself will blot out our sins, to remember them no more against us. We shall have the peace of forgiveness and our pastor will have the joy of having helped us to return to the path of godliness.

Springfield, Ill.

HENRY J. EGGOLD

OCULI

2 COR. 6:11-18

Nobody wants to be a "queer," to stand out from the crowd. Like the chameleon, therefore, we change our color. In dress, talk, standard of living, even the things we laugh at, we conform to the company in which we find ourselves. Hence we Christians, in company of non-Christians, readily become ashamed of our distinctive faith, and hide our witness. We have not the courage to be "different."

Both the Gospel (Luke 11:14-28, esp. v. 23) and the Epistle (Eph. 5:1-9, esp. v. 8) join our text in urging the uncompromising truth: If you are a Christian,

YOU'VE GOT TO BE DIFFERENT

I

Paul's Five Sets of Opposites Demonstrate How Different Christians Actually Are

A. Different in the concept of "righteousness." "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?"

1. On the surface, the difference may not be very evident, for Christian moral standards have to a degree permeated our society.
2. Yet to Paul the difference is decisive.
 - a. In origin. Man's deeds versus God's free gift.
 - b. In acceptability. "Good works" of man are "unrighteousness" to God.

c. In the attitude of man. Self-satisfied pride versus repentant meekness.

3. Thus there can be no fellowship.

a. The difference is not of degree but of a kind. There can be no meeting of minds.

b. The world will not yield. Loves the pride of its own goodness.

c. You cannot yield. By accepting Christ you condemn all human self-justification.

B. Different in the concept of "wisdom." "What communion hath light with darkness?"

1. Human wisdom challenges the implication that Christianity alone has the true light.

a. Boasts of the light of modern science and education.

b. Insists that other religions also have light. What right has one to condemn another?

2. Yet the difference is decisive.

a. Jesus is the Light, man's only answer. What is man? Why evil? Where is there hope?

b. Christians are the light. We alone possess and transmit the truth of Christ.

c. All the wisdom of earth, with its vast accomplishments, shall perish in death and in judgment. Our light alone endures forever, and we with it.

3. Therefore communion is impossible.

a. Physically. Any light which permits darkness to exist is itself darkness.

b. The darkness will not compromise. Proud wisdom of man finds it intolerable that Christ alone should have truth, salvation.

c. You dare not compromise, lest you become darkness, lose Christ.

C. Different in attitude to sin. "What concord hath Christ with Belial?"

1. "Belial" is all that is ungodly, sinful. World makes light of sin and wrath. It says, "I am entitled to get some fun out of life."

God will overlook and tolerate my little faults. My good will outweigh my evil."

2. Such compromise is blasphemy!

a. Christ forgives sin, at the cost of His life — but never makes friends with it! No concord with Satan or Jewish temptors!

b. God forgives, yet remains just even as He justifies (Rom. 3:26).

3. To us the world's attitude is tragic blindness. In love we must protest against it at every opportunity. Harmony with such a world is impossible.

D. Different in the concept of "faith." "What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

1. World sees no problem. It says, "Every man to his own belief." Faith is reduced to "religious opinion and prejudice." Broad religious tolerance accepts everything, believes nothing.

2. Your faith is far more than subjective opinion. You do not just "believe"; you know the eternal truth and reality of God and Christ (1 John 5:13; 2 Tim. 1:12).

3. Thus you have nothing in common with the world. Only he who believes nothing can afford to be "tolerant." With you this is a matter of life and death. The terrible barrier between faith and unbelief may divide you from your closest loved ones (Matt. 10:34 ff.).

E. Different in the knowledge of God. "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God."

1. The world's easy answer. Essential identity of all religions. God has many names, worshipped many ways, but all the same God. Tragedy that men disagree so violently about religions, for God agrees with all!

2. Again we stand decisively apart.

a. Our God a living God, not an idolatrous opinion formed by the mind and imagination of man.

b. Our God tells men how to worship Him. He will not consent to be worshipped as men please.

c. Our God a jealous God, condemning all the world's gods as nonexistent. Not a shadow of compromise in the O. T. or the New.

d. Our God a personal Father — we His temple. He loves, forgives, dwells in us (v. 16).

3. Agreement is impossible! To all liberalism we reply with supreme "narrow-mindedness": "One true God, the Father of Christ. One way of worship, repentance and faith. One true religion, all else is damning idolatry." Thus faith condemns the world!

II

You Are Different. Have the Courage to Show It!

A. God demands it. "Be not unequally yoked. . . ." "Be separate. . . ."

1. God's concern for the purity of His O. T. people. Paul's concern about religious compromisings in Corinth.

2. This message is for us also.

a. Not all contact with the world is forbidden. O. T. Law forbade plowing with ox and ass together, not feeding them in the same pasture. The unbeliever can be your plumber. Even your spouse.

b. Only you dare in no way join him or encourage him in his self-satisfied work-righteousness, his smug tolerance, his false man-made worship.

c. Rather your whole manner of life must reprove him. Reprove his unrighteousness by your humble dependence on the righteousness of Christ; his ignorance by your testimony in Christ; his lighthearted sin by your sober holiness; his unbelief by the certainty of your faith; his idolatry by your confident, fearless, and unashamed reliance on the living God.

d. All this in love and meekness, not snobbery. Only be bold to be different, Christ's new man, a light in the world.

B. This is dreadfully necessary

1. For you, lest by denying Christ you lose Him (Matt. 10:32 f.).

2. For others. You will make enemies. The Gospel is still an offense. But only thus can you save sinners for Christ.

C. Accept the challenge with joy. For the same power that separates you from the world unites you to God (vv. 16 and 18). This is your strength and your glory!

NOTE: Part I presents and refutes the accepted religious philosophy of an overwhelmingly large segment of our society. Since this is entirely the philosophy of the lodge, it is not to be doubted that lodge influence has played a sadly dominant role in making this the Great American Idolatry, even within the organized churches. The separateness, in both its negative and positive aspects, as enjoined in II, A, 2, b-c, is a divine imperative for the individual Christian, also in his relation to the lodge and to members thereof. Thus the lodge problem can be adequately presented within the framework of this outline.

The difficulty is length. Considerable documentation ought to accompany any treatment of the lodge, especially in areas where it is strong. But the material suggested by the text is already so vast. In order to be able to cover the text exegetically, therefore, I have omitted direct reference to the lodge.

New Orleans, La.

PAUL G. BRETSCHER

LAETARE

HEB. 7:11-28

Most modern Christians, even of Jewish extraction, are not, in moments of wavering, under the pressures to return to an abolished priestly system such as the Hebrew Christians experienced in the early Christian decades. Therefore the extended arguments of the first portion of this pericope are not, for ordinary lay people, of the obvious immediate and urgent pertinence which long ago drew these verses from the inspired writer's pen. Nevertheless, they, too, were written for our learning; and they constitute a permanent substratum of foundation for our faith in the uniqueness of our blessed Savior's superiority and perfection as Redeemer and Mediator.

What *is*, of immediate and urgent, as well as perpetual, pertinence is the fact of the divine adequacy for our need of our Lord, now and forever, as our Great High Priest (vv. 24-28). Therefore, let us consider Him of whom it is said that "such an high priest became us" (v. 26), as we ponder:

THE PERFECT ADEQUACY OF OUR DIVINE HIGH PRIEST

I

His Adequacy in His Own Person Toward God and Man

A. He is "holy" ($\delta\sigmaιος$ not $\delta\gammaιος$) (v. 26) in His relationship to God. The Holy One of prophecy (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27).

Uncontaminated by any uncleanness before God. A quality God requires in His representatives (1 Tim. 2:8; Titus 1:8); yet is found perfectly only in Himself (Rev. 15:4). Only Christ can lift up perfectly holy hands to God for us.

B. He is "harmless" — guileless — in His relationships to man. No evil in Him to motivate Him to injure any man. Incapable of aught but good. He alone can be trusted to the uttermost.

C. He is "undefiled," "separate from sinners." Without stain or shadow on His immaculate being. Even the company of sinners, which contaminates to some degree all others (being already conditioned by sin toward evil), touched Him with no pollution. Nothing evil within Him on which external evil could fasten. He knew this. Therefore: "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" upon the cross — His amazement at this sore penalty without His personal guilt.

D. He alone has His Father's sanction of full approval. "Made higher than the heavens." His Father by the Resurrection proclaimed Him "to be the Son of God with power" (Rom. 1:4); and by His Ascension God has "highly exalted Him and given Him a name that is above every name" (Phil 2:9) and "crowned (Him) with glory and honor" (Heb. 2:9). No one else is so personally suited to represent the cause of redeemed sinners before His Father.

II

His Adequacy in His Office

A. He alone needs not to offer sacrifice for Himself, being sinless. He is thus able to fulfill continuously a priest's true function, which is to offer sacrifice valid for *others* (v. 27).

B. He alone could make the one availing sacrifice (done "once," v. 27; 9:26, 28) for sins — the sacrifice of *Himself* — because He is sinless. He alone could be "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." He validated all O. T. sacrifices; He gave to all the future the one eternally valid sacrifice, without which no forgiveness would be possible (dreadful prospect!).

C. He alone has an "unchangeable priesthood" (v. 24), continuing forever. He alone has all the requirements of effective

priesthood, and has them *forever*. Therefore He, and He alone, is "able to save to the uttermost" (v. 25).

D. He alone "ever liveth to make intercession" (v. 25). He remains forever, forever to plead the cause of us who sin daily, before the throne, and forever to apply, for the sake of our forgiveness, the fruits of His atonement to our salvation. Appointed long ago, "a priest forever" (Ps. 110:4), long before the Levitical priesthood, whose intercession was valid only because they represented Him, He exists as our Intercessor always.

How needlessly men are lost! Rejoice that our salvation is founded so adequately and securely and forever upon One who, in person and office, is so perfectly suited to our needs!

Milwaukee, Wis.

RICHARD A. JESSE

BRIEF STUDIES

THE NEED AND THE MEANING OF A PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

[This essay was read to the Commission on Research in Christian Education of the National Sunday School Association, October 12, 1953, Minneapolis, Minn.—Ed.]

Any attempt to cover the topic under discussion within the time allotted is truly an ambitious task. I sincerely hope that the members of the Commission will not fault me for being so rash as to try to cover the implications of the subject within the thirty-minute period. Yet this brief sketch may serve in an elementary way to provoke some discussion, stimulate a little more thought, and perhaps even encourage some worthy colleague to make up a more complete study on the need and especially the meaning of a philosophy of Christian education. Should this hope be realized, the attempt will have been amply rewarded.

A study of the philosophy of Christian education is not a luxury for those impractical minds who seek to avoid the day-by-day encounter with the realities of life. Some conception of a philosophy of Christian education is absolutely necessary for everyone who attempts to teach, even though it be in a most perfunctory way. For the serious teacher a clear formulation of one kind or another is absolutely essential.

Why so? A philosophy of Christian education is necessary because it gives the educator his point of departure. It clearly sets forth the basic principles which are, or at least should be, axiomatic for him as a Christian. These are his unargued principles, from which no appeal is possible, because they are drawn from revelation and are therefore entirely in the realm of Christian faith.

Besides giving the teacher a point of departure a philosophy of Christian education indicates precisely in what direction he should go. The Christian cannot be satisfied simply with nurturing growth, or encouraging creative activities, or producing a vague change. He must know clearly in what direction this growth, this activity, or this change should proceed. Christian education is not busy work on a grand scale, nor is it a baby-sitting program under the auspices of the Church. It has a positive purpose in mind and proceeds in a planned way.

With a point of departure before him and a knowledge of the general direction in which he should move a philosophy of Christian

education provides the teacher with a unifying principle which draws together every type of experience for a single ultimate purpose. It proposes to answer not only the "how" and "what" but also the "why" and the "what for" of our human existence. In short, it provides a Christian *Weltanschauung*.

The Christian teacher with a sound philosophy of education is able to make decisions because he has general principles to guide him and moral truths and axioms to serve as valid criteria for action. On the basis of his philosophy he can formulate good policies and practices in every area of Christian education. His philosophy provides him with norms for setting up day-by-day objectives, organizing the curriculum, selecting teaching material, determining methods, establishing administrative procedures, and evaluating the teaching task.

When an educator has drawn up and formulated his philosophy of education, he is in a position to tell others precisely what his philosophy is, describe the distinctive nature of Christian education, and avoid being absorbed by current anthropocentric philosophies, all of them creatures of the human mind.

No doubt other reasons can be adduced for formulating a philosophy of Christian education. These will suffice for our purpose.

It should go without saying that while most Christian teachers have not formulated their philosophy of Christian education, every one of them has consciously or unconsciously worked out some plan in general conformity with some Christian principles as he has interpreted them. I do not mean that every Christian has always organized his philosophy properly. There have been many vagaries, many inconsistencies, and frequent digressions from the principles which Christians firmly believe. Christian teachers have frequently made decisions as to curriculum and teaching methods which are diametrically opposed to their principles. Because they have not clearly formulated their philosophy, they have not discovered their own inconsistencies. Christian leaders have likewise not clearly thought through the implications of their philosophy in many areas of human experience, so that our teachers have been forced to refer to sources written from a wrong point of view. This has led them astray or has left them dissatisfied. This failure is notably true in the field of psychology, sociology, and all other areas directly concerned with the study of man.

What do we mean when we speak of a philosophy of Christian education? A philosophy is a formulation of principles into a single point of view, a *rationale* of the principles pertaining to Christian education. By a principle we mean, as the term implies, that from which

anything proceeds, namely, the truth or truths which are absolute or axiomatic. They are the unargued assumptions accepted as truth. Hence they cannot, within the most accurate meaning of the term, simply be opinions. Principles, and therefore also our philosophy, are concerned not with the details of the curriculum, the methods, the techniques, or the material, but only with the bases upon which all these rest. We may therefore differ in the details, but we should not differ in our principles.

Which are some of the areas in which Christians should come to an agreement in formulating a philosophy of Christian education? At least six may be listed.

1. *The Focal Point.* The focal point of education must ever be Jesus Christ. Everything we teach, everything we learn, every experience we have, must be evaluated in terms of Jesus Christ. In Him we live and move and have our being. With Paul we say: "I am determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). By Him was the world created (John 1:13), by Him it is preserved (Heb. 1:3), and it exists today to serve Him and will eventually also be judged and destroyed by Him (Acts 17:31; 2 Peter 3:10). On that day the Christian will cast off all that is earthly and earthy and live in body and soul with Him and in Him forever (Job 19:26, 27).

In speaking of Jesus Christ we do not mean a second Moses, but the One who was crucified for all mankind, the Redeemer of the whole world. Thus we do not speak vaguely of God as being the focal point, nor merely God as the Creator and the Righteous Judge, but the God who revealed Himself in Jesus Christ.

This Jesus Christ, our focal point, is also the dynamic in every phase of our life. The Christian lives the life "in Christ." That means he lives the life of the love of Christ which has been engendered in him through the power of the Holy Spirit.

By stating that Jesus Christ is to be our focal point we do not only reject all anthropocentric concepts of education, but we are emphasizing that God cannot be ignored nor become an elective in any educational structure. As all the lines converge on a focus, so all the lines of our life must come to a point in Jesus Christ.

2. *Source of Truth.* While the Christian recognizes several sources of truth, he sets up two distinct categories: a primary source and secondary sources. His primary source is the Holy Scriptures. By primary he means not merely that it is the first source of truth but also that it is the only absolute and unchallenged source of truth. No other source

can ever be placed in judgment over the Scriptures. The Christian refuses to accept the dictum that nothing is to be believed that cannot be grasped or understood. This concept places revelation in subjection to the judgment of human reason.

When we accept the Holy Scriptures as the only primary source of truth, we are at the same time assuming the responsibility to study this source and, in studying it, to make every effort to divorce ourselves from our own environment and allow the Scriptures to interpret themselves. We cannot speak of Scriptural authority unless it actually exists in Scriptures. It is disastrous to confuse Scripture principles with private opinions or even with good rationalizations and verifiable experiences.

The Holy Scriptures, however, are not simply a code of divine regulations or even merely a source of truth. They are a means of grace creating and sustaining saving faith and sanctification.

Yet the Christian is not an obscurantist. He recognizes the secondary sources of truth which God has given him, namely, reason, experience (science), and intuition. He turns to these in purely temporal matters when Scriptures do not give him an answer or for truths to supplement God's revelation. Secondary sources are never absolute in the sense that revelation is. They dare never trespass on the holy ground of the Word. Secondary sources of truth may at times cause us to go back to re-evaluate our interpretation of the Scriptures, but they can never become the deciding factor. Because of man's own limitation and sinfulness he can never allow a secondary source to become the final judge. He uses the secondary sources within their restrictions, because they are divine gifts to declare His glory and to show His handiwork.

3. *The Nature of Man.* With Scripture as his source of truth, the Christian educator has developed certain well-defined principles concerning the nature of man, the learner. Man was created by God and is not the product of evolution. He was created with a living soul and a perfect body (Gen. 2:7). Through the Fall, man became a sinner and thoroughly corrupt in his natural state. The Christian rejects every idea which pictures man to be by nature without sin or declares that original sin implies only the loss of the "supernature."

Though the Christian believes that man is by nature born in trespasses and sin (Eph. 2:1), at enmity with God (Rom. 8:7), and a child of wrath (Eph. 2:37), this depravity is to be understood primarily in terms of his relationship to God. Man has no free will in spiritual

matters (1 Cor. 2:14), but this fact in no wise implies that he has been deprived entirely of a free will in temporal affairs.

Although natural man is without holiness and righteousness and has lost a blissful knowledge of God, he nevertheless retains even after the Fall a knowledge of the divine Law and of God, inadequate though this may be (Romans 1 and 2). Man even in his corrupt state possesses a personality different in nature from that of animals and has a dignity which is not shared by the animal kingdom (James 3:9).

This condition of natural man is always the same in every age and clime.

Though all men are by nature lost, yet God in His love brought about a universal redemption in Christ Jesus (John 3:16) and rendered a complete salvation (2 Cor. 5:19). God was prompted to save man solely by grace (2 Tim. 1:9). The benefits of this redemption are received by us only through faith (Eph. 2:8,9), which is worked in us only through the power of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3), through the means of grace (1 Cor. 4:15; 1 Peter 1:23; Titus 3:5).

Thus the Christian is a reborn creature and stands in a transformed relationship to his God (2 Cor. 5:17). He has a new vision, a new power, a new life (1 Peter 2:9). Only in this new condition can there be truly good works (Eph. 2:10; John 5:15), and Christian education is concerned with training this new life.

Though the Christian by the righteousness of Jesus Christ has become a child of God and a member of the communion of saints, yet he is at all times still a sinner. His life ever manifests this paradox of being a sinner and yet a saint (Rom. 7:15-25; 1 John 1:7-10), of being a saint while still a sinner (Eph. 5:25-27). To assist the Christian in his battle against sin and to acquire the Christian self-discipline, this is the great task of Christian education.

But the Christian is not only a child of God from the cradle to the grave, he is that for an eternity with God. Heaven is the eternal destination of God's children, and eternal damnation is the lot of those who have rejected His only-begotten Son (John 3:18).

4. *The Goal.* Christian education has for its ultimate objective the perfection of the saints (Eph. 4:12, 13).

For the unregenerate the initial step is unification with God through Christ Jesus. Natural man's objectives are not God's, but in Christ the natural man has become a new man and is united with God (Rom. 12:4,5).

The Christian is already at one with God and his education should help him to grow in this relationship. The final purpose of Christ's

redemption was man's sanctification to the eternal glory of God. "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2:10). This fact does not mean that we can separate justification from sanctification, for the two ever go hand in hand. He who is a child of God (justified) will by the very nature of things, once made wise unto salvation, grow toward being thoroughly furnished unto all good works (sanctification) (2 Tim. 3:16, 17; Rom. 12:1). As Luther has put it, Jesus has redeemed me a lost and condemned creature "that I may be His own, and live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness" (Small Catechism).

5. *The Scope.* Christian education is relevant to the whole life of man and penetrates every phase of his existence. We err when we believe Christian education to be merely a matter of religious courses or classes or a matter of defining various religious concepts. It does and must include all these things, but it must go farther and show what implications lie in the Christian doctrine in every phase and activity of life. Education does not only deal with the "know-how" but also with the "what for." Thus Christian education is able to give man his real values and set up his goals. Such moral values are not rooted in man, in society or in religion, but in the Triune God.

Christian education must be relevant to the whole personality of man and strive towards its harmonized development. Man always acts as a total being, for there is constant interaction between the intellectual, the emotional, the volitional, and the physical. Hence every God-given gift within man's make-up must be developed in harmony with God's purposes.

Christian education is concerned with all kinds of people, for as God has "made of one blood all nations of men" (Acts 17:26) and is no Respecter of persons, so Christian education respects the dignity and personality of all men and is concerned with every human being regardless of race, nationality, intelligence, social level, or any artificial strata developed by the human race.

Since education is continuous, the Christian teacher must be concerned with people of all age levels. Christian education never ends (1 John 2:13).

6. *The Agencies of Education.* Christian education recognizes that the home (Deut. 6:4-9), and particularly the father (Eph. 6:4), has the primary responsibility for the education of the child. The Church, too, has received a commission to teach and should ever be ready to

assist the home and the community in accomplishing their task in harmony with the will of God (Matt. 28:18-20).

We also recognize the right of the State to teach, but not to make men wise unto salvation. Education is the responsibility of the State only in order to produce civic righteousness and thereby foster the general welfare of the State (Rom. 13:3-5). In this way the State is working inadvertently in the interest of the Church. Civic righteousness in spite of its limitations, particularly its inadequacy for eternal life, is recognized and blessed here on earth by God because civil righteousness makes it possible for the Church as an institution to carry on its work. The Church can exist under the fire of persecution; in fact, persecution is its greatest challenge for self-expression. But the Church as an institution can carry out its program of activities, such as public preaching, education, and an active mission program, only if it is protected in its endeavors by a measure of civic righteousness, because this righteousness insures at least some semblance of law and order.

These then are the major areas of interest with which a philosophy of Christian education is concerned. Everyone of these has important implications for the educator, for in the formulation of these into a single philosophy the educator is able to set up his goals, develop his curriculum, choose his material, determine his methods, and evaluate the results.

St. Louis, Mo.

ARTHUR C. REPP

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND JOHN

A friendly communication sent by one of our young brethren, Mr. Arthur C. Kreinheder, who is studying at the University of Lund, Sweden, draws attention to the interpretation of Matt. 11:11 sponsored by Professor Hugo Odeberg of the University of Lund. In my meditation published in the *Lutheran Witness* of September 15, 1953, I adhered to the customary exegesis of this passage to the effect that John the Baptist himself was not in the kingdom of God, but announced its coming, and that the term "the least who is in the kingdom of God" refers to any Christian, and that his being greater than John the Baptist is due to his having insights and privileges which the forerunner of Jesus did not have. Dr. Odeberg, known as a stanch conservative Lutheran, in *Erevna*, Vol. VI, No. 3, 1949 (pp. 130-132), submits a different interpretation which certainly deserves careful consideration. His comments appeared in Swedish under the title "Testimony of Christ about John," and Mr. Kreinheder submits the following translation of them.

Matt. 11:11-19 is a difficult text. When Jesus, in v. 11, points out that "among those born of women" there is none greater than John, it shows us John in the human situation. Here, according to Jesus, John's greatness lies not in his great personage nor piety, but in his office, which was to prepare the way for Jesus; he received the authorization through which he can say, "Behold the Lamb of God," precisely the designation of "the One who should come." John the Baptist also used the expression "the One who should come," about Him: "He who cometh after me." (Matt. 3:3, 11 ff.) When Jesus continues with His statement, "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he," He looks no longer at the human situation, but comes with His valuation in the kingdom of God. We must be on our guard against interpretations that are foreign to the words of Jesus and the New Testament, for example, such an interpretation as that John certainly is the greatest in his period, but that now something completely new has come, with a new epoch. The new epoch would be the kingdom of God, and the consequence would be the absurdity that John should not at all belong to the kingdom of heaven. Instead, one should come nearer to the right interpretation if he considers the following:

Against the customary human valuations, which at that time must have considered the Roman Caesar as the greatest, Jesus places John highest. In the human situation, among those of women born, according to Jesus, not the Roman Caesar of that time or any ruler in any historical period is the greatest, but precisely John the Baptist. But thereafter Jesus comes to the valuations in the kingdom of heaven. Who are the least in the kingdom of heaven? "He who receives the least of My brothers, he receives Me." "He who will be greatest must be the servant of others." The least in the kingdom of heaven is, in the deepest sense, according to Jesus' own exposition, Christ. The least in the kingdom of heaven, "Christ," is greater than John himself. When John the Baptist, in the power of his office as a "voice crying in the wilderness," announces the appearance of Christ, he identifies Him with the words, "He who cometh after me." — Thus far Dr. Odeberg.

The weakness of this interpretation in my view is this, that according to the presentation of the Gospels John the Baptist, though he proclaimed the coming of the kingdom, was not a member of it. A passage of importance in this matter is Luke 16:16: "The Law and the Prophets were until John. Since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." John, of course, was a child of God, very dear and precious in the sight of the heavenly

Father, but he did not belong to the Messianic kingdom, which Jesus established. He still belonged to the old dispensation, that of the Law and the Prophets. With the coming of Jesus something new was brought into existence, the gracious reign of God, based on the redemptive work of Christ, constituting a fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies, a reign which operates through the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments. The interpretation of Dr. Odeberg is, of course, altogether in agreement with the analogy of faith, but it seems to me that the view taught by the New Testament writers is a different one.

WILLIAM F. ARNDT

DIES
Jesus
law
was
imp-
ent
the
of
ms
lif-

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

AN ANNIVERSARY YEAR FOR THIS JOURNAL

With the January issue, the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY entered upon its twenty-fifth year of service to our pastors, the first issue having appeared in January, 1930. In that first issue of this journal, the editors wrote:

The *Concordia Theological Monthly* is, in a manner of speaking, a new periodical. It has a new name, selected from a long list of names submitted for consideration, a new cover, a new arrangement of contents; and it is, quite frankly, a bilingual magazine. But it intends, under the gracious guidance of God and assisted by the prayerful help of the brethren whom it chiefly intends to serve, to continue the policies of the former tried and proved periodicals. Its name — *Concordia Theological Monthly* — not only identifies it with the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod, but proclaims that it intends to adhere with full allegiance to all the Confessions of the Lutheran Church as collected in the Book of Concord of 1580. What *Lebre und Webre* taught and defended for seventy-five years, what the *Magazin fuer Ev. Luth. Homiletik* presented for more than fifty years, what the *Theological Quarterly* and the *Theological Monthly* have proclaimed since 1897, that the new *Concordia Theological Monthly* intends to be identified with, to teach, and to proclaim as long as it exists. And in this new undertaking, as in all other projects launched for the benefit of God's Kingdom, our motive and object shall be SOLI DEO GLORIA!

In the foreword of that same issue, Dr. Fr. Pieper expressed his views regarding "ecumenical Lutheranism." In the course of that article he wrote:

Ecumenical Lutheranism regards Holy Scripture as God's own, infallible, majestic Word to which the Church to the Day of Judgment may not add anything and from which it may not detract anything. Even as the Lutheran Church of the sixteenth and seventeenth century was bound by the Word, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," so also the Church of the twentieth century is bound by that selfsame Word until the end of time (p. 3).

1954 will be a year of momentous decisions for Lutheran bodies in our country and perhaps elsewhere. "Ecumenical Lutheranism" is as burning an issue in our day as it was twenty-five years ago. "Ecumenical Christianity" is an even greater issue. It will be the responsibility of the editors of this journal honestly to face these issues, supremely conscious of St. Peter's injunction, "If any man speak, let

him speak as the oracles of God" (1 Peter 4:11). In dedicating themselves to this task, the present editors of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY beseech the prayerful support of the readers of this journal.

P. M. B.

FULGENS CORONA

In commemoration of the centennial of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, December 8, 1854, which established the Roman dogma of Mary's immaculate conception, Pope Pius XII has proclaimed 1954 as the Marian Year, and published the encyclical *Fulgens Corona*, the Radian Crown. The encyclical reads as follows:

"The radiant crown of glory, with which the most pure brow of the Virgin Mother was encircled by God, seems to Us to shine more brilliantly, as We recall to mind the day on which, one hundred years ago, Our Predecessor of happy memory Pius IX, surrounded by a vast retinue of Cardinals and Bishops, with infallible apostolic authority defined, pronounced and solemnly sanctioned 'that the doctrine which holds that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary at the first moment of her conception was, by singular grace and privilege of the Omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, Savior of the human race, preserved from all stain of original sin is revealed by God, and therefore to be firmly and resolutely believed by all the faithful.'

"Celebrate the Marian Year which We proclaim to be held the whole world over from the month of December next until the same month of the coming year—just a century having elapsed since the Virgin Mother of God, amid the applause of the entire Christian people, shone with a new gem, when, as We have said, Our predecessor of immortal memory solemnly decreed and defined that she was absolutely free from all stain of original sin.

"We firmly trust that during the celebration of this Marian Year fervent prayers be offered throughout the world to the most powerful Mother of God, who is also our tender mother; and that in those prayers special requests be made of her efficacious and ever-present patronage that the sacred rights which are proper to the Church [i.e., the Roman Church] and which the very exercise of human and civil liberty demands, may be openly and sincerely recognized by all.

"Since, however, solid sincere and tranquil peace has not yet appeared in souls and among peoples, let all strive with pious prayer to fully and fruitfully obtain and consolidate it, so that, just as the Most Blessed Virgin brought forth the Prince of Peace, so also may she, by her protection and patronage, unite men in friendly agreement."

F. E. M.

THE NATURAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD UPHELD

Under this heading the *Australasian Theological Review* (March to June, 1953) comments editorially on a recent defense of the *theologia naturalis* by Dr. Helmut Echternach. Dr. H. Hamann, the author of the editorial, writes:

"More than once in the course of the last few years we have found it necessary to warn against theological opinions which, probably emanating from the teachings of Karl Barth, have tried to weaken the concept of *theologia naturalis* or to banish it from Lutheran theology altogether, representing it as an element of Scholasticism and Aristotelianism uncritically taken over by the older Lutheran dogmaticians. We have pointed out that occasional overstatements on the part of some dogmaticians should not be permitted to offset what is undoubtedly Scripture doctrine, and we have been distressed when meeting, in a milieu commonly regarded as reflecting orthodox and conservative Lutheranism, a tendency to explain away, in the interest of a theologically indefensible thesis, Scripture texts which simply refuse to be neutralized or minimized. It is the more interesting and important to find a scholar rising to the defense of the cavalierly-treated *theologia naturalis* in the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*. He is Dr. Helmut Echternach, pastor of Hamburg and lecturer on Systematic Theology in the *Kirchliche Hochschule* (university) of that city. An essay from his pen entitled 'Theology and Ontology' runs through several issues of the journal named. We quote from the issue of October 15, 1952 (p. 154).

"In my judgment the clarification of this question (*i.e.*, of the *theologia naturalis*) is of decisive importance for preserving the specifically Lutheran doctrine of faith. The content of the Christian faith is not the existence of God, but the grace of God! Only when the existence of God is acknowledged *before* (italics in text) faith, when God is recognized as the Giver of the Law and feared as the Judge, does trust (*fiducia*) in His grace become possible. Consequently the traditional proofs of the existence of God, in particular, the moral proof, so often adduced by Luther, are not without theological value. They form an integral part in the knowledge of God under the Law, which renders the message of the Gospel audible. The denial of every form of *theologia naturalis*, which is current today also in Lutheran theology, means in fact that the Law is no more taken seriously, and that therefore faith is no longer understood as the blessed assurance of salvation. In that case faith includes the existence and the judgment of God and appears as a fabric of theses which *must* (italics in text)

be believed. If the true relationship (*Korrelation*) between Law and Gospel is destroyed, the Gospel itself has become Law.

"Hence in the background of the thesis widely accepted by the adherents of Dialectic Theology, viz., that the existence and the essence (*Dasein und Sosein*) of God dare not be separated, there stands revealed the typically Calvinistic confusion of Law and Gospel — according to Luther the most diabolical of all temptations (*Anfechtungen*). . . . For if the Christian message is no longer conceived as the (divine) reply to the desperate need caused by sin and the Law, it will appear first as a legal dogma and eventually as a thesis of an undemonstrable and improbable metaphysic. The Church would then be in the peculiar position of offering to the world a message of salvation for which there exists no desire whatever. It can emerge from this incongruous situation only by recalling its real commission, by insisting that its true message is not to proclaim the existence of God — which, indeed, can be *proved* (italics in text) by philosophy and the history of religion and of the world with a probability of at least 99.9% — but the essential quality (*das Sosein*) of God: His judgment and His grace, Law and Gospel."

"From this quotation it may appear as though Dr. Echternach considered the natural knowledge of God and His Law as sufficient to arouse in man the *terrores conscientiae*, the consciousness of guilt and dread of the righteous judgment of God, without further witness of the Law from the revealed Word of God. However, this is hardly the author's meaning, since he plainly includes the preaching of the Law in the proper and necessary proclamation of the Church. What really concerns us here is the vindication of the natural knowledge of God and of the common proofs for the existence of God by a writer who rests his case on altogether different suppositions than uncritical dependence upon the old Lutheran dogmaticians. Perhaps this marks the beginning of the backward swing of the pendulum, toward a more just and adequate appraisal of the questions under consideration, as far as modern theological thinkers and writers are concerned. To which might be added a moral: Blessed is the theologian who, unperturbed by the winds or currents of theological and philosophical thoughts of the hour, adheres to the teaching of the abiding Word; for he will be spared the humiliating necessity of constant revision and adjustment."

J. T. MUELLER

MARIOLOGY AND MARIOLATRY

"Born of the Virgin Mary. Such is the Creed's simple affirmation of the temporal origin of the humanity of Christ, whose Divine Nature

as the Son of the living God is eternal." So writes the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, D. D., in his introduction to William Hermanns' *Mary and the Mockers* (Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Ind.). No Protestant will demur at this confession of faith. But when the distinguished author and radio speaker continues: "But if Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, is born of Mary, it is true in a lesser degree that every true Christian who is a member of the Body is also born of her," the theologically informed Protestant raises his eyebrows in protest. And when he reads Rev. Sheen's final statement in that introduction: "Our Lord said that unless we are reborn, we cannot live in His Kingdom. But can a man be reborn without a woman?" he gasps for breath and explodes as did the Athenians: "May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears" (Acts 17:19, 20).

The fact of the matter is that Rev. Sheen is merely voicing sentiments regarding Mary and her place in the divine scheme of salvation which are widely current in Roman Catholic literature and which seem pale and colorless when compared with the extravagant apostrophe to Mary uttered by Pope Pius XII last December in his proclamation of the Marian Year. In that prayer the Pontiff said:

Enraptured by the splendor of your heavenly beauty, and impelled by the anxieties of the world, we cast ourselves into your arms, O Immaculate Mother of Jesus. . . . Bend tenderly over our aching wounds. Convert the wicked, dry the tears of the afflicted and oppressed, comfort the poor and humble, quench hatreds, sweeten harshness, safeguard the flower of purity in youth, protect the Holy Church, make all men feel the attraction of Christian goodness!

Mariolatry has been traced back to the fourth century. There have been periods in the history of the Church when it flowered into full bloom. In the past century it appears to have become the safe haven of Roman Catholic apologists to which they flee for refuge from the onrushing tides of modern secularism. The difference in approach to the veneration of Mary between the present half-century and the preceding one, is pointed out by Drs. Gibb and Nitzschke in an article published by the *Evangelischer Bund-Konfessionskundliches Institut* (May-August, 1953). In this article, the authors, who have examined and annotated a substantial body of materials dealing with Mariology, make the significant comment:

It appears to be a Mariological axiom to attribute everything to Mary that might in any way elevate, honor, and praise her. Already fifty years ago, Roman Catholics affirmed all honors accorded Mary in our day. But at that time writers were still, by and large, critical

and consulted Scripture and tradition for shreds of evidence. In our day, this approach has practically disappeared.

In passing, it might be noted that, according to the authors quoted, the standard German work on Mariology and the one most often quoted in Roman Catholic sources is Paul Straeter's three-volume *Marienkunde* (1947, Ferd. Schoeningh, Paderborn). The titles of the several volumes of this comprehensive work read: *Maria in der Offenbarung*, Vol. 1 (384 pages); *Maria in der Glaubenswissenschaft*, Vol. 2 (360 pages); *Maria im Christentum*, Vol. 3 (390 pages).

In this Marian Year in which the Roman Catholic Church is commemorating the 100th anniversary of the promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin (December 8, 1854), the "Queen of Heaven" will be accorded honors due only Jesus Christ, the Son of God. In view of this tragic development in the Christian Church, Protestants may well take to heart the observation made by the *Church of England Newspaper* (Time, December 28):

This prayer [the reference is to the prayer composed by Pius XII for the opening of the Marian Year and quoted in part above] transplants faith from Christ to the Virgin Mary. . . . And what, we may legitimately ask, is left for the Holy Spirit? The Virgin Mary, apparently, displaces the Third Person of the Trinity as well as the Second. . . . Such devotion is what might be expected of a church under the domination of a celibate hierarchy. The normal development of their personality through family life is forbidden them; they must perforce find a substitute to occupy the place a wife should have in their imagination.

Lutherans will, in addition, bear in mind the strictures Martin Luther voiced in his *De servo arbitrio* and in his *Lobgesang der heiligen Jungfrau Maria, genannt das Magnificat*. The passages read:

A teaching nowhere taught in Scripture, and not proved outside Scripture in any form of evidence, is not a part of the Christian faith, but rather belongs into the category of Lucian's fables. [Lucian was a Greek satirical author who lived in the second century of our era.] It must be remembered, however, that Lucian writes and enjoys good-humored banter. But the people with whom we are dealing act indiscreetly in a very serious matter, which, besides, has to do with eternal salvation, and they do so to the detriment of countless souls (WA 18, 661).

The Virgin Mary does not like to hear those vain babblers who preach and write much regarding her merit merely in order to demonstrate their own great ability. They fail to see how they blunt the *Magnificat*, accuse the mother of God of lies, and minimize the grace of God. For the more merit one ascribes to her, the more one

reduces divine grace and diminishes the truth of the *Magnificat*. The angel, moreover, greets Mary only with "Thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee" and that she is blessed among all women only for these reasons. Therefore all those who heap so much praise and honor on her are in great danger of making an idol out of her, just as though she were concerned that one should honor *her* and look to *her* for benefits, whereas she spurns all this and wants God to be praised in her (WA 7, 568).

P. M. B.

RECENT ROMAN CATHOLIC LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

In *Die Theologische Literaturzeitung* (June, 1953), Prof. Leonhard Fendt of Augsburg presents an overview of recent contributions made by Roman Catholic scholars to New Testament interpretation. We reproduce the principal thoughts of the long and interesting article.

The greatest work of the Roman Catholics in the field of New Testament exposition parallels, according to the author, the popular *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, extensively used in Evangelical areas. The Catholic work bears the title *Das Regensburger Neue Testament*, so called because it appeared in the Verlag Friedrich Pustet in Regensburg. So far nine volumes have appeared, and the tenth, an index volume, will be published soon. Already some volumes are appearing in a second edition, an indication that the work satisfies a definite demand. It is read mainly by the clergy and such laymen as are interested in the Bible, which, as the writer says, is true also of *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*. Both commentaries are intended not so much for persons who are to be won for Bible study, but rather for those who already read the Bible. The main problem (Professor Fendt thinks) facing those who read these commentaries is how to make those "Biblical" (devoted to Scripture) who use them.

Professor Fendt next discusses the commentaries on Matthew and Luke by Joseph Schmid, pointing out the serious problems with which Catholic scholars must wrestle who are bound to the official interpretation of the Church. Very interesting is the question, propounded by Schmid, whether the promise in Matt. 16:18 f. concerned only Peter or whether it extended also to his successors. Schmid thinks that the words of the text say nothing of the latter, but that the doctrine of the primacy of the Pope, while not expressed directly in the text, rests upon the inference of the sense (*in der Konsequenz des Sinnes*).

Dr. Fendt finds much to praise in Wikenhauser's *Commentary on Revelation*, which he regards as equaling those of Behm and Johannes Weiss. Wikenhauser defends the eschatological (*endgeschichtliche*)

interpretation of the Apocalypse, but so that this must be joined with contemporary history (*zeitgeschichtliche Deutung*). He interprets the prophecy concerning a millennium (ch. 20) figuratively.

J. T. MUELLER

THE MODE OF BAPTISM

In the *Lutheran Outlook* (October, 1953) Rev. N. J. Holm discusses the insistence of Baptists on immersion as the only right way of administering the Sacrament. He shows both from history and the Bible that "to baptize" does not necessarily mean "to immerse." For this statement he quotes the historical fact that at Syracuse, Sicily, there is a baptismal font from about A. D. 200, about 12 inches deep and able to hold only 3 gallons of water, which bears the following inscription in Greek: "Zosimus consecrated and dedicated to God this holy vessel for the use of Holy Baptism." The writer remarks: "Here at least Christians were not immersed." A painting from A. D. 107 in one of the Roman catacombs represents the Baptism of Christ by John, who pours water on His head. The writer quotes Dr. Withron, who says: "The testimonies of the catacombs in respect to the mode of Baptism, as far as they go, are strong in favor of sprinkling or pouring" (quoted from "The Catacombs of Rome").

From the article we select two more points. Pastor Holm writes: "The Baptists tell us that the Ethiopian eunuch was immersed, because it says in Acts 8:38: 'And they both went down into the water,' and in verse 39: 'And when they came up out of the water.' . . . Eusebius, Jerome, and authorities on the time of the Apostles inform us that there was not enough water there to immerse the eunuch in."

The traditional place where Philip baptized the eunuch is still being pointed out to tourists on their way from Bethlehem to Hebron. When in 1952 the undersigned visited the place, there was not enough water in the pool for the Arab women assembled there to wash their clothes. Baptists exclaimed in surprise: "This is the last time I will quote this passage for immersion."

A second point which Pastor Holm makes in his article is that Baptists quote Luther as preferring immersion, for he is supposed to have said: "Baptism is nothing else than the Word of God with immersion." But what Luther really said is this: "Baptism is nothing else than the Word of God in water" (*Die Taufe ist nichts anders denn Gottes Wort im Wasser*).

J. T. MUELLER

THE CONFESSIONAL CHARACTER OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

In May, 1937, the "Confessing Church of Germany" (*die Bekennende Kirche*) agreed on a number of theses, the scope of which was that altar

fellowship between Lutherans, on the one hand, and the Reformed and "United" (*Unierte*), on the other, is not contrary to the Scriptural administration of the Lord's Supper. Since the resolutions were adopted in the city of Halle, they are known as the "Halle Resolutions" (*die Hallenser Beschluesse*). In the *Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung* (August 15, 1953) the Rev. Dr. Matthias Schulz, a leading divine of the Breslau Synod, points out that the Halle Resolutions are untenable. Three parts of the thorough and lengthy discussion are devoted to historical and doctrinal considerations, while the fourth sums up the results of the investigation. Dr. Schulz shows that it is the sacred obligation of the Church not to treat the manner of the Lord's self-communication in the Holy Supper as an open question, but to confess it in such a way as the Lord Himself has declared it. For this reason the Lord's Supper in the Lutheran Church has always been a confessional act of primary importance. Lutherans therefore have always refused altar fellowship with the Reformed. Also with respect to this doctrine human reason must not be regarded as a *principium cognoscendi*, but Christ's words [of institution] must be obeyed with childlike faith. Christians who surrender the clear words of Christ and so forsake the foundation of Scripture will finally lose themselves in generalities and abstractions by which nothing is decided and nothing is gained. Confession of the pure doctrine of Scripture also includes the rejection of the contrary doctrine, and this implies denial of altar fellowship to those who teach and tolerate false doctrine.

In conclusion Dr. Schulz states that no proof can be advanced that the confessional antitheses between Lutherans and Calvinists have been overcome. Nor can 1 Cor. 10:16,17 be so interpreted as to show that there may be altar fellowship between the two groups that hold contrary doctrines. For this reason confessing Lutheran groups cannot accept the Halle Resolutions.

One admires the frank and emphatic, yet friendly and objective way in which Dr. Schulz declares his conviction. The fact that the editor of the *Ev.-Luth Kirchenzeitung* has published Dr. Schulz's article proves that Lutherans in the VELKD are willing to listen to and consider the views of the spokesmen of the Lutheran Free churches.

J. T. MUELLER

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

According to Rev. Horton Davies (*Theology*, September), Jehovah's Witnesses are expecting the second advent and millennium to arrive sometime before 1984. Then God's "Great Theocracy" will

be established on earth, and Jehovah's Witnesses will be the only survivors to share in the divine kingdom.

Quoting "Judge" Rutherford, one of the most ardent devotees of the movement (died in 1942), Jehovah's Witnesses have already decided how the problem of feeding the resurrected bodies may be solved. The passage from Rutherford's *Riches* (p. 188) reads:

Remembering the Lord's promise that in the millennial period "the earth shall yield her increase" and that the desert and the wilderness-places of the earth shall become as a Garden of Eden, we may safely estimate upon all the land, which we may find, according to recent estimates, to be 57,000,000 square miles or over 36,000,000,000 acres. What would this mean as to space for each individual who has ever lived in the world, i. e., 28,441,126,838 persons? It means that there would be 1,275 acres for each little village of 200 families. Quite a sufficiency of room, all will agree, under the new conditions promised. But if more space be necessary, with faith we will readily see that it will be quite within the divine power to raise vast continents from the depths of the ocean, or indeed to give a literal as well as symbolical fulfillment to the declaration—There shall be no more sea.

Perhaps the most fitting retort to such wild speculations, as Rev. Davies reminds his readers, is that of Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr that faith has nothing to do with either the furniture of heaven or the temperature of hell.

Jehovah's Witnesses are not only schismatics, they are also heretics. Rev. Davies summarizes their chief false teachings in the following words:

1. Their doctrine is largely based upon the obscurities of such apocalyptic books as Daniel and Revelation, implying that the revelation of God is a tangled skein only to be unravelled by the subtle minds of this sect. But Christianity is not a mystery religion for initiates, for "we have seen the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," who declared, "I am the Light of the World."
2. Their doctrine is based upon an arbitrary selection of texts from the Scriptures, but the main body of the teaching of Jesus and His apostles is either evaded or perverted; and to each ounce of the Bible a hundredweight of speculation is added.
3. To use the Bible as an *Old Moore's Almanac* of prediction is to misunderstand its purpose and to claim to know more than our Lord Himself, who confessed that He did not know the time of the coming of the Son of Man again on the clouds.
4. Their creed must be rejected because it offers salvation on too easy terms, affirming, in effect, that payment for it may be deferred

to another existence. This is to repudiate the solemn and urgent Either—Or of the Bible and to sentimentalize the conception of a holy God. Moreover, this is a salvation by good works, not by faith in the victory of Christ.

Jehovah's Witnesses are on the march. They gave evidence of it at their recent convention in New York. They are on the march in Europe. They are on the march in other parts of the world. That march can be halted only by the proclamation of the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ and by the persistent efforts of the Church to teach its members all that the Lord of the Church commanded. P. M. B.

BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

Chicago.—Lutheran welfare leaders adopted recommendations for more effective church social work at the close of a two-day conference here.

The meeting, sponsored by the Division of Welfare of the National Lutheran Council, was attended by 50 delegates representing finance departments, welfare boards, and institutions of the eight Lutheran bodies affiliated with the Council. They agreed:

Chaplaincy services are a vital part of the spiritual-social mission of the Church and should be integral parts of the program of Lutheran welfare agencies and institutions.

Services to unmarried parents should receive emphasis in the Lutheran welfare agency program. But Lutheran welfare agencies should not operate primarily as placement centers for the children of unwed parents. Chaplain, parish pastor, and case worker should function as a team in group service to the unmarried father and mother.

Social agencies should not only maintain homes for the aged but also emphasize services in rehabilitation, recreation, and occupation for older persons.

Community resources and trained leaders should be used to bring spiritual and social service to alcoholics.

Churches should make greater efforts in helping immigrants come to the United States, integrating them into American life and welcoming them to church membership.

Lutherans' consciences should be "quickened" to community, State, national, and international injustices and conditions that are contrary to God's will.

"Lutheran welfare councils should study social issues and legislation and give constructive counsel to public officials and legislative bodies," the delegates recommended.

They also proposed that Lutherans establish a social and spiritual ministry for seamen on an international basis.

Dr. Clarence E. Krumbholz of New York, executive secretary of the Council's welfare division, said:

"Lutheran agencies are beginning to evaluate themselves, hoping to reframe programs to meet today's higher social standards. We recognize that we must meet modern, changing situations.

"Our chief aim is to increase the effectiveness of Lutheran welfare services as an integral part of the Church's mission."

The conference was the third and last in a series of Lutheran welfare meetings held here. The 1951 conference discussed programming and financing, the 1952 sessions financing, and this year's meeting programming.

Melbourne, Australia. — Formation of a laymen's movement within the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia was decided upon at the annual meeting of the Church's Synod held in Horsham, Victoria. It will be known as the Lutheran Brotherhood of Australia.

The Synod also voted to retain membership in the Lutheran World Federation and to continue participation in the Lutheran mission in New Guinea. It co-operates in the mission with the Commission on Younger Churches and Orphaned Missions of the National Lutheran Council (U.S.A.), the American Lutheran Church, and the Neundettelsau Mission Society of Germany.

The question of L.W.F. affiliation came up as a result of the denomination's proposed union with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia, which is not a member of the Federation. Theses of agreement, drawn up by an intersynodical committee of the two Churches, were accepted by the U.E.L.C.A. Synod at the meeting, leaving further steps toward union to be discussed at meetings of the intersynodical group.

Washington, D. C. — A resolution warning newspaper editors against letting down the bars against blasphemous language in the press was adopted by the Union of Holy Name Societies of the Archdiocese of Washington.

The resolution deplored "the increasing frequency with which blasphemous words are spelled out in our daily newspapers."

"Such indiscriminate and uncalled-for use of blasphemy," it said, "affronts the religious sensibilities of all people who believe in God and respect His name and has a particularly harmful effect on young and immature readers."

Dallas, Tex. — How 20,000 gospel tracts were dropped behind the

Iron Curtain by balloon this summer was described here by the man who supervised the project.

Arrangements were made with a press in Switzerland, owned by an American woman, to print gospel leaflets in Russian, Polish and Czech, Mr. Marvin Sheffield, president of the General Conference of the Congregational Methodist Church, said. A factory in the Netherlands turned out 20,000 balloons for them in a little over a week.

A little group of "Bible-thinking Germans" who had been working on the project in Nuernberg released 5,000 of the tract-bearing balloons. The remaining 15,000 were sent on their way to Communist countries in batches of 5,000 a night whenever the wind was favorable.

Washington, D. C. — Plans for the first Lutheran high school in the nation's capital have been launched here.

A Lutheran high school association has been formed by members of Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod churches in the Washington area. The denomination now maintains high schools in 13 Midwestern cities.

There are 16 Missouri Synod churches in the capital area with more than 6,000 members. Several of these churches maintain day classes for younger children, but formation of the high school association represents the first step towards the development of a full-fledged elementary and secondary school system.

Berlin. — A delegation of thirty-six prominent churchmen to represent the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKID) at the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston, Ill., next August, was appointed at sessions of the EKID Council here.

The delegates will include Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, chairman of the EKID Council, Bishop Hanns Lilje of Hannover, president of the Lutheran World Federation, Pastor Martin Niemoeller, president of the Evangelical Church of Hessen and Nassau and EKID foreign secretary, and Dr. Reinhold von Thadden-Trieglaff, president of the German Evangelical Church Day (*Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchentag*) movement.

Munich, Germany. — The "new look" announced in Hungarian internal policies by Premier Imre Nagy last June is, by all accounts, having an effect on religious life in the Communist satellite country.

There are signs that the government's rabid antichurch policy—which probably was stronger in Hungary than in any other Communist land—is being gradually relaxed.

Articles attacking the Roman Catholic hierarchy, priests and the attitude of the faithful have almost disappeared from the Communist

press. The hierarchy is obviously relieved, even though the respite may prove temporary.

Cairo.—Egyptian Interior Ministry has ordered that permits be granted immediately to the Jewish Community Council in Alexandria and to various Christian groups in provincial towns to build places of worship for their communities.

Requests for erecting non-Moslem places of worship frequently had been delayed or ignored in the past.

As a result of the new order, a Jewish synagogue will rise on Moharram street in Alexandria; three Coptic Orthodox churches at Kafr el-Sheikh and Mit Bishar in the Nile Delta and at Port Fuad on the Suez Canal; a Coptic Catholic church at Luxor in Upper Egypt; and a Latin (Roman Catholic) church and convent in Kafr-el-Zayat in the Nile Delta.

In addition, two half-completed churches—one Coptic the other Protestant—whose permits had been revoked, will be finished.

Copenhagen.—Mrs. Bodil Koch, 50, a graduate theologian and leader in Denmark's feminist movement, was named Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs in the new Social Democratic cabinet.

Wife of Hal Koch, who is professor of church history at the University of Copenhagen, Mrs. Koch served in the same Cabinet post in 1950. She is a member of Parliament and mother of four children.

Racine, Wis.—The board of education here voted to deny the use of a public school on Sunday mornings to a Lutheran group for church services.

It rejected a request from the Rev. M. W. Albrecht, pastor of a newly organized congregation of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

The action taken by the school commissioners was based on the advice of a board member, attorney Manny S. Brown, that use of the school by a church group would violate the state constitution.

The congregation had asked permission to hold services in the school until a church building is constructed.

St. Paul, Minn.—One of the greatest problems facing the Church in America today is "the undergirding of our rural life with an adequate religious faith."

This was stressed to the National Convocation on the Church in Town and Country here by Dr. A. D. Mattson, professor at Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill. The convocation was sponsored by the National Council of Churches.

Delivering the opening convocation address, Dr. Mattson said that two-thirds of the rural population of the United States—40 million people—do not belong to any church or denomination, and that there are states where the proportion of rural people attached to a church is as low as 10 and 12 per cent.

Thus, he pointed out, 13 million children and young people of school age in rural areas receive no religious instruction.

"The rural areas are the sources of population," he said, "and the character of these areas will largely determine the character of the country as a whole.

"More than half of those reared in rural areas migrate to cities. If the religious needs of these young people are not provided for during the formative years of their lives, it is not probable that they will creatively participate in the work of the churches in the cities to which they migrate."

Chicago.—Delegations from four Lutheran denominations, with a combined membership of nearly two million, met here to consider a proposed form of organization which may merge them into one Church in 1957 or '58.

They comprised the Joint Union Committee, known as the Committee of 36, which represents the Evangelical Lutheran, American Lutheran, United Evangelical Lutheran, and Lutheran Free Churches.

The Augustana Lutheran Church, which had participated in the unity discussions for a time, formally withdrew in November, 1952, on the grounds that it was primarily interested in a merger of all Lutheran Churches.

All five bodies are members of the American Lutheran Conference.

At their national conventions last year the four negotiating Churches agreed on doctrinal matters by accepting a "united testimony on faith and life."

In its sessions here the union committee attempted to frame a joint statement of polity and shape an organizational structure for the proposed united Church.

The committee voted to meet here again December 7—9 to "finalize" the union plan it will present to the four Churches.

Dr. O. G. Malmin of Minneapolis, editor of the *Lutheran Herald*, who attended the meeting, said, "We believe it would be progress to make one Church where there were four before."

Dr. Hans C. Jersild, Blair, Nebr., president of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, presided at the sessions.

Louisville, Ky.—Unity among Lutheran Churches was emphasized at the biennial convention of the American Federation of Lutheran Brotherhoods here.

Speakers on panel discussions of home missions, scouting, and Lutheran fellowship stressed ways in which the six groups constituting the Federation could work more closely together.

The Federation includes laymen of the American Lutheran Church, Augustana Lutheran Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Suomi Synod, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Lutheran Church. Some members of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod attended convention sessions as observers.

Berlin.—Communist leaders, adept at rewriting history, have turned this talent to the field of religion and nominated a "hero" of their own as "the real leader of the Reformation" in place of Martin Luther.

This was disclosed by Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, head of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKID), in his Reformation Sunday sermon at East Berlin's Mary Church.

Denouncing the "attempt to minimize Luther," Dr. Dibelius said that children in East German schools are being taught that Thomas Muenzer, German Anabaptist leader during the Peasant Revolt and advocate of "Communist theocracy," brought about the Reformation.

Jefferson City, Mo.—A way out of the controversy over transportation of parochial students in public school busses was offered here by Missouri Attorney General John M. Dalton.

He ruled that public school districts may sell their school busses and enter into contracts with private bus operators for the transportation of pupils.

Mr. Dalton previously held that private bus operators who have contracts with public school districts may also transport pupils who attend parochial schools. The latest ruling apparently clears the way for transportation of parochial students under the auspices of public school districts.

Rome.—Pope Pius XII has granted permission to the University of St. Louis, a Jesuit institution in St. Louis, Mo., to build in his name a new memorial library which will contain microfilm reproductions of more than 600,000 manuscripts in the Vatican Library.

L. W. SPITZ

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

As I REMEMBER. By Edgar J. Goodspeed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 315 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. \$3.50.

Here we have one of the great autobiographies of our generation. It is safe to predict it will be read with gratitude and delight not only by Dr. Goodspeed's many friends and former students but also by countless others. Although he is now 82 years old, he still writes with that ease, grace, and charm which characterized all his utterances when a number of us heard him as teacher and lecturer decades ago. What an immensely varied, rich, and interesting life he has had! And how many accomplishments he has packed into it! He talks about his labors and successes with modesty and does not hesitate, with a wry smile, occasionally to refer to reverses and condemnatory judgments that fell to his lot. Whoever wishes to inform himself on the rise and development of the University of Chicago can do it here; Dr. Goodspeed, whose father, a Baptist minister, was one of the founders, saw this famous institution come into existence, and up to his retirement he played a prominent role in its history. Those interested in the origin of the RSV are here given a few glimpses of how this version was produced, for Dr. Goodspeed was one of the revisers. There are two endeavors described in the book to which I must draw special attention. The one is the production of *The New Testament—an American Translation*, which has made the name of Goodspeed probably better known than that of any other Biblical scholar of our day. In 1948, when the 25th anniversary of this translation was observed, already more than a million copies had been sold. With more than one chuckle Dr. Goodspeed gives an account of the indignant utterances of editors and others who criticized the "audacity" he displayed in making the Apostles and Evangelists speak in our present-day vernacular. Now, when the dust and smoke of the skirmish has largely drifted away, he stands vindicated in public opinion, I believe. The other matter which I should like to stress is the author's vital connection with the field of textual criticism and his success in procuring Bible manuscripts for what is now the Goodspeed Collection at the University of Chicago. If anyone thinks that dealing with musty manuscripts must be a very dull occupation, he is urged to read the chapters entitled "Adventures with Manuscripts," "Finding a Byzantine Art Gallery," and "Manuscript Hunting." I wish that especially our young ministers and students of theology would

read this work because it will show them the importance of making good use of their time while the vigor and alertness of youth are still theirs. Dr. Goodspeed at one period of his life was afflicted with serious eye trouble, which threatened to bring on complete blindness and necessitated his avoiding all close work with artificial light. Evidently it was only through enormous industry and concentrated efforts when natural light was to be enjoyed that he achieved enviable eminence as a papyrus specialist and New Testament scholar. The work, I should say in conclusion, is liberally interspersed with anecdotes and animated humorous dialog to make it not only instructive but entertaining reading as well. May it help in the advancement of Biblical studies. WILLIAM F. ARNDT

THE NEW TESTAMENT. AN HISTORICAL AND ANALYTICAL SURVEY.
By Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953. 474 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{3}{4}$. \$5.50.

This is a first-rate book, written by the Dean of the Graduate School of Wheaton College. Though intended in the first place as a textbook for college classes, it can do excellent service in any advanced instruction, also in private study by cultured laymen, theological students, and pastors. Here is an introduction that actually introduces. To show the context of divine revelation, the author first devotes 120 pages to a picture of the New Testament world (political, social, economic, religious). Then the 27 books of the New Testament are presented in an arrangement that gives the student a clear picture of the development of the Apostolic Church from its origin in the person and work of Christ to its consolidation toward the end of the First Century. Ample material (supplemented by maps and charts) is offered to show the place of each writing in this historical development and to unfold its specific message. The author's analytical outlines are original and frequently very suggestive for the teacher or preacher. In fact, the whole book is written in a style that makes for pleasant reading. At the same time one senses the hand of an experienced teacher and finished scholar who distinguishes between the essential and the peripheral, between established fact and debatable hypothesis. One may at times dissent from his historical judgments on some matters of introduction (e.g., *James* and *Galatians* the oldest Epistles) as well as, occasionally, from some exegetical conclusions (e.g., p. 260: Rom. 7:13 ff. as applying to the unconverted man; p. 367: 1 Peter 3:21, the water of Baptism as merely "emblematic"). But the book as a whole is sound in sober scholarship, evangelical in theology, skillful in methodology, and one can only wish it much success. Attention should be called to the excellent select bibliography appended to the book. VICTOR BARTLING

IN CHRIST. By William Grossow, translated by Martin W. Schoenberg. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press. 134 pages plus an index of Scripture texts. \$2.25.

This little booklet was prepared by a Roman Catholic professor as a

sketch of the theology of St. Paul. It is intended to be a map, a guide which will serve the lay reader in particular in his study of St. Paul. The author sets out to take some of the most important and difficult concepts of St. Paul and to reduce them to simple language. In this task he succeeds rather well.

In general it may be said that this volume is an eloquent commentary on the fact that where the Roman Church has strong competition from Evangelical Christianity, it can and often does produce books intended to help people understand the Bible better, something that does not happen in countries where the Roman Church is in complete control. There it is even difficult to find copies of Scripture. (We tried it in Italy during the War. No one seemed to be able to even suggest where a copy of the Scriptures might be found.) Dr. Grossouw teaches at the University of Nijmegen in the Netherlands. There the situation is quite different.

This volume makes wholesome reading primarily because it underlines the truth that the Church is not chiefly an external organization. The author spends a good bit of his time on that point. He seems to be very much aware of the fact that this is a matter which needs much stress in Roman Catholic circles.

The various chapters have to do with sin, the flesh, the Law, and death.

With all of its good points it must nevertheless be said that the author never quite succeeds in escaping from the over-all framework of Roman theology. For instance, the anthropology he describes is that of the classical world as modified somewhat by theology. "Flesh," for instance, does not mean to the author the total man as alienated from God, but only one part of him comprising passions and desires. Moreover, he makes this very remarkable statement about the Apostle Paul: "Paul never loses sight of the freedom of the will" (p. 20). That is a very strange sentence in view of the last verses of Romans 7.

For the author, Paul is the writer also of the Letter to the Hebrews. True, he very rarely refers to Hebrews, perhaps because he himself felt that the Pauline authority is rather difficult to maintain in the light of all the evidence to the contrary. Nevertheless, he continues to uphold the traditional position of the Roman Catholic Church. In that light, too, this is an interesting volume. It demonstrates two things in particular: It underlines the strength of Roman Catholic theology when it must answer Evangelical criticism of its position; on the other hand, it shows its weakness in having to conform to certain answers even before the question has been thoroughly studied and discussed. We have a feeling that Dr. Grossouw is a spirit akin to that of Father La Grange, who repeatedly ran into difficulties with his Church because of some positions he took with respect to New Testament interpretation, particularly textual criticism.

A new age is dawning for Biblical scholarship in the Roman Catholic Church. This particular volume will be one small milestone along the route.

MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN

A THEOLOGY OF THE LIVING CHURCH. By L. Harold De Wolf. Harper and Brothers, New York, N. Y. 383 pages, $6\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$. \$5.00.

Dr. L. H. De Wolf is professor of systematic theology at Boston University, where he occupies the chair once held by Albert C. Knudson, his predecessor and teacher. His "dogmatics" is described by the publishers as a "comprehensive systematic theology, interpreting the Christian faith for men and women of our day." In a review of the book Prof. J. C. Bennett remarks: "The book is written on the basis of theological 'liberalism' by a theologian who has kept his mind open to the 'post-liberal' development of theology." To the reviewer this appears as an excellent characterization of Dr. De Wolf's attempt at restating the Christian doctrine for all who desire a "rational faith." The book deserves praise on account of its clarity, brevity, simplicity of statement, and comprehensiveness of doctrinal content, and, so far as externals are concerned, its admirable mechanical make-up. But to the conservative Christian believer this "systematic theology" is most disappointing. It retains the Christian terminology, but interprets the Christian faith in the light of rational, modern thought, preserving none of the Gospel essentials in the traditional sense. To the author the Bible is a fallible book with internal contradictions, differences between texts, contradictions of known truths, evidences of legend-making, morally unworthy passages, and the like (p. 68 ff.). Nevertheless, the Bible is the inspired Word of God. In its more elevated portions, or as a whole, it claims both inspiration and authority. Inspiration is neither verbal nor plenary in the traditional meaning of these terms, but the Bible was written by "an extraordinary stimulation and elevation of the power of men who devoutly yielded to God's will" (p. 76). The Bible therefore has authority as a whole, in its message concerning the great central themes (p. 83). Higher, however, than the authority of the Bible is that of the "totality of human experience," as this occurs in the Bible and in the "thinking of the most careful and critically disciplined minds" (*ibid.*). God's unity is a development, and no doctrine of the Trinity can go beyond the *Shema'* of the Jewish synagog (pp. 89 ff.). The correct doctrine of the Trinity is not that formulated by the ancient Christian Church, but the Trinity describes "one God in three modes of revelation" (p. 278). If "labels" must be used, the author is willing to call his view of the Trinity a "modified Sabellianism" or a "type of Modalism" (p. 279). Sin is a violation of a person's "moral judgment" (p. 180), but at the same time also disobedience to God, since "for the members of the Christian community the supreme norm is the will of God" (*ibid.*). The author agrees with A. C. Knudson, who found in habit one of the chief explanations of the origin of sin in the individual (p. 192). There is in man a divine image, because there are in him characteristics which mark him as like God (p. 203), such as a sense of moral obligations, aspirations to goodness, and the like (*ibid.*) Man must repent in the sense of a movement toward moral perfection that is upstream (p. 199). Jesus is the

Son of God inasmuch as we see God's glory revealed in Him (p. 255). At Calvary God revealed to sinners the despicable evil of sin and His own glorious love, but this does not mean a substitutionary atonement in the sense of conservative theology (p. 268). The kingdom of God is the realm in which His will is done "as it is in heaven," that is, completely (p. 299). Baptism is a symbolic act, signifying a cleansing (p. 345). Infant Baptism is justifiable, not because it removes the guilt of original sin, but because it welcomes children into the community of divine love (p. 346 ff.). The Lord's Supper symbolizes the fellowship of faith (p. 349 ff.). It is perhaps not quite fair to judge the book entirely on the basis of a few thoughts taken from it. Nevertheless, the thoughts quoted show how the author desires to adapt the Christian faith to the understanding of men and women who no longer are in agreement with traditional theology and therefore are looking for *Ersatz*. The method of the author is not new, for he uses approaches such as we find in Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Adolph Harnack, Fosdick, and other liberal predecessors. We recommend the book for study by those who wish to acquaint themselves with the new type of liberalism that is becoming more and more popular in Anglo-Saxon areas as a substitute for existential theology. St. Paul refused to preach the Gospel *en sophia logou*, lest the Cross of Christ should be made of none effect (1 Cor. 1:77). Just that has happened to the theology of this book.

J. T. MUELLER

JEHOVAH OF THE WATCHTOWER. By Walter R. Martin and Norman H. Klann. New York: Bible Truth Publishing Society, 1953. 125 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$1.75.

This study by two Baptist ministers centers in an exposé and refutation of Jehovah's Witnesses' denial of the deity of Christ. This section answers fully the cultists' standard arguments as they are presented in the New World translation of the New Testament. But this study is hardly—as the Introduction states—"the first full-length portrait of the movement." Nor does it describe such central points of the sect's message as its ransom theory and its concept of Jehovah's theocracy. F. E. MAYER

THE GOSPEL OF PRAYER. By Albert Cassel Wieand. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953. 245 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. \$3.00.

Dr. Wieand has given a great deal of thought to prayer. His aim in writing this book has been "to take up the basic truths or ideas in Christ's philosophy of prayer one by one in their functional aspects, to understand them clearly and analytically, and then to present them as interestingly as possible to the average Christian." The book may, therefore, be viewed as a biography of the prayer life of Jesus, with the purpose of presenting a perfect pattern of prayer for Christians to emulate.

Perhaps a remark is in order regarding the title of the book. It would be better not to include the word "Gospel." This joyful word is at present

used in so many different ways that it is losing much of its original significance as the good news of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. The indiscriminate use of a word cheapens it.

The indefinite use of a word may also reflect unclear thinking with respect to its primary meaning. The reader is reminded of that in searching this volume for a clear definition of the term "Gospel." In a book on prayer such a definition should appear somewhere, for instance, in the chapter on praying in the name of Jesus. Wherever the redeeming work of Jesus is concerned, one ought to expect a precise statement regarding the vicarious atonement. That is the touchstone with which also this book must be tested. But such a statement is missing. Whereas the author correctly defines the names "Emanuel-Jesus" as "God with us to save us," he continues: "But has Jesus finished the work of redeeming the world? Or is He still at it? He was at it then, through His human body. He is at it now, through His body the church." It may be merely a typographical error when in quoting 2 Cor. 5:19, 20 the book says: "He has committed to us the work [sic] of reconciliation," but it is in harmony with the previous statement. Paul, however, did not say "work" but "word." Redemption is solely the work of the Redeemer; proclaiming it is the work of His people.

This difference is important in defining the phrase "praying in the name of Jesus," which means no more than to pray believing in Jesus as the Redeemer. Only because I am a child of God through faith in Jesus as my Savior can I appear before the throne of the Father with my prayers. Any other prayers, no matter how fervently spoken, are futile.

L. W. SPITZ

KARL BARTH'S KIRCHLICHE DOGMATIK. By Otto Weber. Basic text, 162 pages; supplementary volume, 92 pages. Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1950, 1952. DM. 9.00.

Barth's *Kirchliche Dogmatik* is planned to comprise five volumes. Thus far three volumes have appeared; each in at least two separate volumes of approximately 700 pages, much of it in fine print, a total of about 5,000 pages. In the first part of Vol. I Barth discusses Prolegomena under such heads as the Word of God, the Triune God, the Incarnation of the Word. Barth devotes the second section of Vol. I to the Holy Spirit and the Holy Scriptures. In Vol. II Barth takes up the Knowledge of God, the Reality of God, His Election, and His Commandment. Vol. III, which comes in four separate volumes, takes up Creation, Anthropology, Divine Predestination, and Ethics. Barth is planning a fourth volume to discuss reconciliation and a fifth to take up the doctrine of redemption.

Not many theologians are in a position to go through Barth's *Summa*, and Otto Weber's *Compendium* will serve to acquaint the interested theologian with the chief thoughts of Barth's system. Weber, professor at Goettingen, makes no attempt to interpret Barth. His concern is merely

to reproduce the gist of Barth's theology by quoting climactic sentences from Barth or condensing into a short sentence material covering a dozen pages in Barth's *Dogmatik*. Anyone who has attempted to follow Barth's dialectical method as expanded in his *Dogmatik* will experience the same difficulties when reading Weber's synopsis. The supplementary volume, devoted chiefly to Barth's ethics (Vol. III, 3 and 4), is not as condensed and hence more satisfactory than the first. As a *compendium* Weber's introduction to Barth's *Dogmatik* is recommended as faithfully presenting Barth's theology.

F. E. MAYER

CAMPUS GODS ON TRIAL. By Chad Walsh. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953. 138 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$2.50.

Dr. Chad Walsh is professor of English at Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., "poet in residence," and editor of the *Beloit Poetry Journal*. In the volume before us he discusses with great vividness and charm the "campus gods" or, in other words, the prejudices that keep students from accepting Christianity and joining a Christian church. There are, among other things, "atmospheric reasons," "psychological reasons," "heartfelt reasons," and also "Christian reasons," why students do not become Christians. He analyzes these with great acumen and then "fits the jigsaw puzzle together," setting forth the "credentials of Christianity" and showing finally that the whole of Christianity might be centered in the three concepts "man, God, and love." There is much which Christian campus directors and college professors can learn from this book. Very helpful also is the appended bibliography for students who wish to do further study in Christianity, though here largely liberal writers are suggested, such as Henry P. Van Dusen and George A. Buttrick. While the author uses the traditional terms of theology, he does not seem clearly to profess the traditional Christian theology. To him, for example, the Trinity appears to mean only that God is experienced in three different ways (p. 127), which means that his concept of the Trinity is modalistic. In an interesting "Appendix" the writer shows that of the hundreds of students that were asked why they were not Christian, twenty-six per cent mentioned as their reason "science versus religion," while twenty-one per cent mentioned "ignorance," seventeen per cent "Christians" ("People in the churches are a poor advertisement for Christianity"), but only ten per cent "Puritanism" ("If you are a Christian, you cannot have fun") and also only ten per cent "changing times" ("Christianity is old stuff"). Dr. Walsh shows his admiration for C. S. Lewis in many ways and often applies his method. His book *C. S. Lewis: Apostle to the Skeptics* has interested a wide circle of readers.

J. T. MUELLER

REPORT FROM CHRISTIAN EUROPE. By Stewart Winfield Herman. Friendship Press, New York, N. Y. 212 pages. \$2.50.

Europe is the buffer continent between East and West. In a sense, it

is hardly a continent. It is the western extension of the northern half of Asia. What will happen to Europe? Will it be absorbed by the East? Will it retain a *quasi* independence of both East and West? Will it eventually become a protectorate and bastion of the West? Or what else will be its future? These are questions which chiefly concern statesmen. But they are questions also which Christians interested in the future of the Church cannot evade. Rome, Constantinople, Moscow, Canterbury, Geneva, and Wittenberg are, after all, in Europe. Whatever happens to the churches in Europe will eventually affect the churches in the rest of the world. The churches of Europe deserve therefore to be studied, to be understood, and to be watched.

The challenge posed by the Christian churches of Europe is the burden of Dr. Herman's latest book, which might be regarded as the last of a grand trilogy depicting the problems of the Christian Church in Europe. The other parts of the trilogy are *It's Your Souls We Want* and *The Rebirth of the German Church*.

Dr. Herman brings to his task more than seventeen years of rich experiences in Europe as American pastor in Berlin, as promoter of the program of Christian relief and reconstruction sponsored by the World Council of Churches, and, for several years after 1948, as director of the L. W. F. Service to Refugees. The nature of his responsibilities compelled him to travel far and wide in Europe, to become intimately acquainted with church conditions, even with the churches behind the Iron Curtain. He has modestly labeled the results of his experiences "report." But the book is more than a report. It is a course in current European church history. It is a sweeping—though sometimes too sweeping—synthesis of some of the most significant aspects of the religious life in Europe as seen by an American. In his colorful panorama, the author investigates such areas as Church-State relations in various European countries, socialism and the Church, Communism and the Church, the pretensions of the Vatican, and others.

Here are some relevant questions to which the author supplies clear and explicit answers: What about Martin Niemoeller, Bishop Otto Dibelius, Bishop Lajos Ordass, Professor Josef Hromadka? What about Tito's attitude toward the Church? What about the *Una Sancta* movement? What is the real aim of the Evangelical Church of Germany? What about the religious life in Roman Catholic countries like Italy and Spain, and in Lutheran countries like Norway and Sweden?

Whoever is interested in what is happening on the religious front in Europe will profit much from a careful study of this book. Whoever plans to tour Europe next summer *ought* to read this book and spend more time with it than with attractive folders mailed by tourist agencies which, in recent years, seem to have a penchant for featuring the Eiffel Tower, the Tower of London, the Tower of Pisa, and some church towers. All

these towers will someday crash like the Tower of Babel. But we may be sure, as Grundtvig puts it:

*Built on a Rock the Church doth stand,
Even when steeples are falling.*

And there is no history more intriguing than the history of the Christian Church.

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

AMERICAN EDUCATION AND RELIGION: *The Problem of Religion in the Schools*. By F. Ernest Johnson, ed. New York: Harper and Brothers. 211 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. \$2.00.

The complexity of the issues surrounding the place of religion in American education gives value to this book as a contribution toward a basic understanding of these issues. The "American dilemma in education" is discussed by eleven authors representing the Experimentalist, Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant views or positions. The authors agree in the judgment that religion ought to have a place in education as an essential element of a wholesome culture. However, as can be expected in such a symposium, they differ sharply in opinion with regard to such subsidiary problems as the meaning of Church and State separation, the validity of the private or parochial school in a democracy, the released-time question, and especially the what and how of religious instruction. If general agreement has been reached on the one hand, that organized religion must not attempt to dictate the program of the schools, and, on the other hand, that a negativistic attitude toward the religious faiths of our people must not be perpetuated in American education, then the question still remains: Which constructive course can be taken? We are reminded of Luther's advice, "Pray God that He make many more Christians."

A. G. MERKENS

THE BREVIARY EXPLAINED. By Pius Parsch. Translated by William Nayden, C. Ss. R., and Carl Hoegerl, C. Ss. R. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo., and London, England, 1952. 459 pages, $5\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{8}$. Price, \$6.00.

The work of Pius Parsch, the renowned Augustinian of Klosterneuburg, is by no means unknown in America. His *Messerklärung* has been available in an English translation, published in America, for almost twenty years. (*The Liturgy of the Mass*. By Pius Parsch. Translated by Rev. Frederic C. Eckhoff, with a Foreword by the Most Rev. John J. Glennon, D. D., archbishop of St. Louis. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo., and London, England, 1936. 358 pages.) In 1947 its 13th impression was released by the presses of the Herder Book Company. His *Jahr des Heiles*, which is currently being done into English and of which the first volume of the English translation is available, enjoys widespread popularity also outside the pale of the Roman Catholic Church. Between 150,000 and 200,000 copies of the original German version are today in use. When

therefore the present translation of Pius Parsch's *Breviererklärung* appeared in published form in 1952, the many admirers of Pius Parsch once more rejoiced. They had good cause to rejoice, for this noted Augustinian of Austria employs a style which radiates warmth and sincerity. In his writings he carefully avoids academic perplexities, and he knows how to write in a popular vein without becoming banal and platitudinous. An evangelical spirit permeates his work. Unlike many other authors of his Church, he does not indulge in the use of vitriolic tirades against the Reformation movement of the 16th century. As a result his writings have become popular also among Lutherans and Protestants of Europe and America.

These various virtues find eloquent expression also in the present excellent translation of Pius Parsch's *Breviererklärung*. The book is interesting as well as refreshing and edifying. It will stimulate the intelligent lay reader as well as the well-read liturgiologist. This applies to all its parts, of which there are three chief divisions: I. Fundamental Notions; II. The Constituent Parts; III. The Spirit of the Breviary. In Part I the author sets forth reasons why a breviary is important and why it should be used in the liturgical life of a people. Many of the reasons adduced are valid also for nonmembers of the Roman Catholic Church; they help to make clear why not a few among ourselves are of the opinion that a Lutheran breviary should today be made available among the Lutherans of America, as has been done among the Lutherans of Germany. While the publication of a Lutheran breviary would likely meet with much indifference and some opposition, Parsch's section on "Some Historical Notes on the Breviary" (pp. 10—28) offers proof that such indifference and opposition have been encountered even among the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church.

The section devoted to a discussion of "The Constituent Parts" of the breviary (pp. 48—184) offers much information which likewise will be of benefit to Lutheran and Protestant readers. Parsch is perhaps at his best while discussing the Psalms. His remarks glow with warmth and healthy insight. His statements regarding the benefits we of today may derive from those very personal Psalms of David, in which he implores the Lord to pour His wrath and displeasure on those who hate and persecute the son of Jesse, are indeed sound, enlightening, and Scriptural. Pius Parsch possesses good Scriptural insights. It is relatively seldom that he says something to which we as Lutherans must take exception. While his clarity of presentation and his lucid style permit one to read his writings with facility and ease, he does, of course, as a thinker and as a theologian, force one occasionally to weigh and to ponder. Thus, while discussing "The Spirit of the Breviary" (pp. 187—449) and the "Structure and Spirit of the Hours" (pp. 187—203), he inadvertently halts one's progress for a moment with the remark: "Objective spirituality lets God take the lead; it answers in prayer. Subjective spirituality leaves the initiative to man, striving to make himself receptive of God's Word" (p. 189). One is forced,

on the one hand, to think of the far extreme to which the Church of Rome goes in her insistence upon objectivity in worship; on the other hand, one thinks, too, of Protestants going to just as far an extreme in the opposite direction. We Lutherans seek the middle course, but our work, too, is encumbered by the activities of extremists and radicals of various types.

While reading *The Breviary Explained*, one is amazed again and again at the richness and the depth of the Roman rite. Not only the Mass, but also the Breviary of Rome is the product of ages. Parsch's book, despite the simplicity of its approach, illustrates that the Breviary is a storehouse and a thesaurus for those who seek spiritual edification and deepening in the liturgical heritage of the Christian Church. But here perhaps, too, lies a defect of the Roman rite, and its strength thus becomes its weakness. It seeks to say and do too much. It engulfs and submerges one; its diet becomes too heavy, particularly for the undernourished and the underfed. Not only the common-run worshiper, but even the theologian and the scholar is at times overwhelmed and easily frustrated. Even if one discounts the ceremonialism involved, the food itself is too often too highly concentrated. One has at his disposal too much of a good thing. One longs for simplicity and must fight off the temptation to become either an unreasonable iconoclast or an antiliturgical ascetic. When, in addition, the Mass or the Breviary are used in an ancient and unknown tongue, the problem becomes even more acute, and one then realizes how very dangerous and ineffective an extreme type of liturgical objectivity can become. We admire Pius Parsch not only for being aware of this fact but also for taking action to offset these dangers. He is among the front-rank leaders of the Roman Catholic Church who advocate using the Missal and the Breviary in the language of the people and thus differs radically from Dom Gueranger and others, notably of the Solesmes school, who oppose the use of the vernacular with fervid revulsion and deep-rooted antipathy. Under the sponsorship of Klosterneuburg and under the leadership of men like Pius Parsch, the *Volksliturgische Apostolat* is meeting with such widespread success that it has reached also the shores of America. While Parsch's interest in the use of the vernacular becomes evident from many of his writings, notably in his *Volksliturgie—Ihr Sinn und Umfang* (Volksliturgischer Verlag, Klosterneuburg, Vienna, 1940), it asserts itself also in *The Breviary Explained*, e. g. on page 448, where we read: "In every church and parish the faithful should assemble, morning and evening, to pray the Office in the name of the whole community. And naturally, as head of the community, the pastor will, and should, participate in this prayer in the vernacular tongue."

Those who are interested in the Lutheran liturgy and in its various component parts, in the church year, and in a gratifying interpretation of liturgical Psalms will find Pius Parsch's *The Breviary Explained* to be eminently worth while. The book contains much that will be of use and benefit to the Lutheran preacher and to the Lutheran liturgist.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

CHRIST AND WOMANKIND. By Peter Ketter. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press. 446 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. \$5.00.

The original work, of which this is a translation recently reprinted, was published at Dusseldorf in 1935. Its purpose is to present the teaching of Christ and His Church concerning womankind, dealing, first, with the status of woman before His coming; next, with His contribution to, and requirements of, womankind; and, last, with individual women in the life of Jesus and in the Apostolic age. According to the introduction, the book was intended as an answer to unbelieving critics who had been flooding Germany with literature that sought to undermine the credibility of the Gospel and to represent Christ as a product of human ideology. It reflects thorough research, but as the *nihil obstat* and *imprimatur* suggest, much Roman tradition and doctrine has been skilfully interwoven. The discerning pastor, however, who is able to prove all things and to keep that which is good, will be able to glean from the book helpful material on the subject of Bible women or Christian woman, especially in the sections based on the Passion and Easter story.

O. E. SOHN

PREACHING FROM PICTURES. By Kenneth W. Sollitt. W. A. Wilde Company, Boston, Mass., c. 1938. xv + 150 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. \$2.50.

This book is a revised edition of a volume on a type of service infrequently attempted. The publisher furnishes nearly a thousand black-and-white prints for such use. The suggestions of the author will not find general acceptance, since they involve matters of taste and liturgical decorum. The addresses sometimes draw more upon sentiment and imagination than the suggestions of Scripture. Nevertheless many a pastor will find the work stimulating toward his own efforts in preparation for special and incidental services. One volume has appeared of Lenten sermons which are correlated with pictures ("Pictures of the Passion" by W. F. Bruening in *God Goes to Golgotha*, Concordia Publishing House, 1948). Interesting is Mr. Sollitt's suggestion that Hofmann's *Christ in Gethsemane* indicates "rest and peace and tranquility" after the agony, prayer, and aid in the Garden.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

GREAT PROTESTANT FESTIVALS. By Clarence Seidenspinner. Henry Schuman, New York, N.Y., 1952. 148 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$. \$2.50.

The present-day Protestant spirit of this book is revealed by the very first words of the first chapter, which read as follows:

Everyone loves a party! What fun it is to celebrate a birthday with gaily wrapped packages, good friends, and a huge cake all glistening in its very own candlelight! What fun it is, on a holiday, to pack a picnic basket, invite the neighbors to share the day, and to go off to the woods or the beach! Everyone likes to mark a special occasion by some kind of celebration. Everyone likes to put a halo around

life's festive moments. No wonder that Protestant Christians enjoy the yearly cycle of worship.

While Mr. Seidenspinner, who is at present a special instructor in literature and the fine arts at the Garrett Biblical Institute, accepts the traditional seasons of the church year, he prefers a church calendar which is built around the autumn, the winter, the spring, and the summer cycles. He is aware that traditionally the new year of the Church begins with the First Sunday in Advent, but he says: "Rally Day — marks the official beginning of the new church year" (p. 37). The author's approach to the character and problems of the church year differs strongly at times from that of the so-called liturgical churches. The view is typical of a large segment of American Protestantism. His attitude towards the Lutheran Church and her traditions is respectful. He says: "The Lutheran Church is, of course, one of the major branches of Protestantism. It has always preserved the best liturgical practices of antiquity . . . Lutheran programs . . . are inclined to make less of the social or fellowship aspects of Lent than the freer Protestant churches do. Furthermore, their Lenten topics are more inclined to remain within the framework of the Bible rather than to lift up for consideration important aspects of the common life" (pp. 88, 89). One finds much information in the book regarding the rise and character of Mother's Day, the Festival of the Christian Home, Rural Life Sunday, Memorial Day, Children's Day, Vocation Day, and other days observed by American Protestantism.

WALTER E. BUSZIN

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

The following titles in the F. B. Meyer Library, a collection of reprints of works by this distinguished English Baptist evangelist, who died in 1929 at the age of almost eighty-two:

ABRAHAM, OR THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH. 160 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

DAVID, SHEPHERD PSALMIST-KING. 160 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

MOSES, THE SERVANT OF GOD. 189 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

PAUL: A SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST. 155 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

EPHESIANS: A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY (*Key Words of the Inner Life*). 126 pages. Cloth. \$1.95.

SOME SECRETS OF CHRISTIAN LIVING. 120 pages. Cloth. \$1.95.

THE PRESENT TENSES OF THE BLESSED LIFE. 127 pages. Cloth. \$1.95.

THE SHEPHERD PSALM. 128 pages. Cloth. \$1.95.

1000 BIBLE OUTLINES: SERMON OUTLINES FOR PASTORS AND CHRISTIAN WORKERS, with a foreword by F. B. Meyer. By F. E. Marsh. 1953. 493 pages. Cloth. \$4.95. Apart from a note of the publishers to the user, this is an unaltered reprint of the 1925 edition of Marsh's *1000 New Bible Readings*.

SPURGEON'S SERMONS, Vol. XX, with an introduction by W. C. Wilkinson. By Charles Haddon Spurgeon. 1953. 397 pages. Cloth. \$2.95. A reprint of the final volume of the Memorial Library edition, of particular interest because it is a biography of the distinguished preacher.

From Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

OUTLINE STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: ACTS TO EPHESIANS. By William G. Moorehead. 1953. 247 pages. Cloth. \$3.50. An unaltered lithoprinted reissue of a textbook by the late Presbyterian Bible scholar, William G. Moorehead of Xenia Theological Seminary.

BIBLE STUDENT'S ENGLISH-GREEK CONCORDANCE AND GREEK-ENGLISH DICTIONARY TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By James Gall. 1953. 374 pages. Cloth. \$4.95. An unaltered photolithoprinted reissue of the 1863 edition of a useful New Testament reference work.

From Moody Press, Chicago:

THE NEW TESTAMENT: A PRIVATE TRANSLATION IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE PEOPLE. By Charles B. Williams. 1953. 575 pages. Cloth. \$3.00. This is an unaltered reprint of the 1937 edition of a translation of the New Testament that a number of Protestant scholars have declared to be one of the best English translations in existence.

BEYOND HUMILIATION: THE WAY OF THE CROSS. J. Gregory Mantle, D.D. 7th edition, revised. No date. 248 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

This is a reprint of a half-century-old series of 21 meditations on the denial of self through the daily taking up of the cross.

From Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, New Jersey:

NOTES ON THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD. By Richard Chenevix Trench. 1953. 518 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

NOTES ON THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. By Richard Chenevix Trench. 1953. 517 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

This and the preceding title are complete photolithographed reprints of two great exegetical classics which have lost none of their freshness or their relevance during the almost one hundred years that have elapsed since their first publication.

From the Westminster Press, Philadelphia:

KARL BARTH'S CHURCH DOGMATICS: *An Introductory Report on Volumes I:1—III:4.* By Otto Weber, trans. by Arthur C. Cochrane. 1953. 253 pages. Cloth. \$6.00.

The useful digest of Karl Barth's great *Kirchliche Dogmatik* reviewed on page 168 of this issue — including the supplement — is here offered in thoroughly readable English form.

w
lk-
95.
ar-

NS.
an-
ple

K-
53.
he

GE
th.
on
ed

n-

he

ix

th.

of
or
ed

on
3.

ed
in